DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 248 206 SP 024 950

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Loadman, William E.; Holcomb, Zelda J. |
| TITLE | Follow-Up of 1978-1979, 1980-1981, and 1981-1982 Graduates at the Ohio State University's College of Education. Technical Report #8 [and] Executive Summary. |
| INSTITUTION | Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Coll. of Education. |
| PUB DATE | Dec 83 |
| NOTE | 197p. |
| PUB TYPE | Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Statistical Data (110) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC08 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | Academic Aspiration; Career Development; *Education Majors; *Education Work Relationship; Graduate Surveys; Higher Education; *Job Satisfaction; Outcomes of Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Effectiveness; *Student Characteristics; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Employment |
| IDENTIFIERS | *Ohio State University |

ABSTRACT

A follow-up study was conducted of graduates of the College of Education at Ohio State University (OSU). A questionnaire obtained information regarding: (1) present job status; (2) job satisfaction; (3) student teaching experience; (4) attitudes toward preservice academic training; (5) educational background and aspirations; and (6) demographics. The results of these analyses are presented in this technical report. Demographic information and select questionnaire items for each sample year are presented in tabular form. Based on these tables, a profile of each sample year is presented. The next section contains a discussion of questionnaire items by employment subgroup (teaching, education-related field, noneducation-related field). The subgroups are discussed for each sample year, and differences within those years by program area, sex, and teaching level are presented. A comparison between years of each subgroup is also presented. The next section contains a discussion of a group of items regarding the student teaching experience and a group of items dealing with the educational background of the respondents. Appendices contain the follow-up questionnaire and the two informational letters mailed with it. The statistical analyses that produced significant results are also in the appendix. (JD)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED248206

# FOLLOW-UP PROJECT

## TECHNICAL REPORT #8 (1983)

DR. WILLIAM E. LOADMAN

DIRECTOR

SP024950

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William E. Loadman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Technical Report #8: Follow-Up of 1978-1979, 1980-1981 and 1981-1982 Graduates at The Ohio State University's College of Education

December, 1983

Prepared by:

William E. Loadman
Zelda J. Holcomb

Produced for the OSU College of Education as part of a total effort to redesign teacher education. This project is funded entirely from State of Ohio, Department of Education Project 419 monies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | PAGE |
|---|---|
| LIST OF TABLES | iv |
| INTRODUCTION | |
| Samples | 1 |
| Questionnaire Modification | 2 |
| Data Processing | 3 |
| Statistical Analyses | 3 |
| Organization of the Technical Report | 4 |
| PROFILE OF SAMPLE YEARS | |
| 1978 - 1979 | 5 |
| 1980 - 1981 | 7 |
| 1981 - 1982 | 9 |
| Comparisons by Sample Year | 18 |
| TEACHING | |
| 1978 - 1979 | |
| Method of Obtaining Employment | 19 |
| Description of Current Teaching Position | 19 |
| Measures of Performance | 20 |
| Professional Interaction in the School Setting | 20 |
| Teaching Perspective | 21 |
| Comparisons on Program Area, Teaching Level and Sex | 21 |

PAGE

1980 - 1981

Method of Obtaining Employment..... 22

Description of Current Teaching Position..... 22

Measures of Performance..... 22

Professional Interation in the School Setting..... 23

Teaching Perspective..... 23

Comparisons on Program Area, Teaching Level and Sex..... 23

1981 - 1982

Method of Obtaining Employment..... 24

Description of Current Teaching Position..... 24

Measures of Performance..... 25

Professional Interaction in the School Setting..... 25

Teaching Perspective..... 25

Comparisons on Program Area, Teaching Level and Sex..... 26

Comparisons Among Sample Years..... 27

EDUCATION RELATED EMPLOYMENT

1978 - 1979..... 43

1980 - 1981..... 43

1981 - 1982..... 44

Comparisons Among Sample Years..... 45

NONEDUCATION - RELATED EMPLOYMENT

1978 - 1979..... 49

1980 - 1981..... 50

1981 - 1982..... 50

Comparisons Among Sample Years..... 52

PAGE

COMPARISONS BY SUBGROUPS

Total Sample..... 53

1978 - 1979..... 53

1980 - 1981..... 53

1981 - 1982..... 54

STUDENT TEACHING

1978 - 1979..... 59

1980 - 1981..... 59

1981 - 1982..... 60

Comparisons Among Sample Years..... 60

IDENTIFIED CURRICULUM AREAS FOR INCREASED EMPHASIS..... 63

SUMMARY..... 67

APPENDICES

Appendix A - Follow Up Questionnaire..... 70

Appendix B - Informational Letters..... 74

Appendix C - Sample Year Profiles..... 76

Appendix D - Teaching Subgroup..... 80

Appendix E - Education Related Subgroup..... 125

Appendix F - Noneducation-Related Subgroup..... 139

Appendix G - Employment Subgroup (All Sample Years)..... 156

Appendix H - Student Teaching Items..... 178

Appendix I - Population and Sample Sizes by Program Area..... 180

LIST OF TABLES


| TABLE | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1978 - 1979 Chi-Square By Program Area | 6 |
| 2 | 1978 - 1979 Chi-Square By Sex | 6 |
| 3 | 1980 - 1981 Chi-Square By Program Area | 8 |
| 4 | 1980 - 1981 Chi-Square By Sex | 8 |
| 5 | 1981 - 1982 Chi-Square By Program Area | 10 |
| 6 | 1981 - 1982 Chi-Square By Sex | 10 |
| 7 | Program Area | 11 |
| 8 | Sex | 12 |
| 9 | Age | 12 |
| 10 | Race | 13 |
| 11 | Currently Employed or Unemployed | 13 |
| 12 | Full-Time/ Part-Time | 14 |
| 13 | Type of Current Employment | 14 |
| 14 | Usefulness of Educational Preparation | 15 |
| 15 | Consideration of Further Professional Study | 15 |
| 16 | Whether or Not Student Transferred | 16 |
| 17 | Satisfaction with Current Employment | 16 |
| 18 | Years of Teaching | 17 |
| 19 | Employed in Major or Minor Field | 17 |
| 20 | Full-Time/Part-Time Employment | 28 |

| TABLE | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| 21 | Most Helpful Method For Securing Employment..... | 28 |
| 22 | Method For Obtaining First Position..... | 29 |
| 23 | Rating of the Educational Placement Office..... | 29 |
| 24 | Location of Current Position..... | 30 |
| 25 | Level of Teaching ..... | 30 |
| 26 | Size of Present School..... | 31 |
| 27 | Racial Mix of School..... | 31 |
| 28 | Motivation of Present Students..... | 32 |
| 29 | Present Classroom Discipline..... | 32 |
| 30 | Satisfaction with Current Employment..... | 33 |
| 31 | Feelings About Teaching..... | 33 |
| 32 | Usefulness of Educational Preparation..... | 34 |
| 33 | How Well Prepared to Teach..... | 34 |
| 34 | Level of Confidence..... | 35 |
| 35 | Teaching Effectiveness..... | 35 |
| 36 | Ways to Improve Effectiveness..... | 36 |
| 37 | Assistance with Discipline..... | 36 |
| 38 | Expectations for Supervision Extracurricular Activities | 37 |
| 39 | Participation in Extracurricular Activities..... | 37 |
| 40 | Pay for Supervising Extracurricular Activities..... | 38 |
| 41 | Who Evaluates Teaching..... | 38 |
| 42 | How Many Times Evaluated..... | 39 |
| 43 | Most Meaningful Evaluation Method..... | 39 |
| 44 | Person Helpful in Professional Development..... | 40 |

| TABLE | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| 45 | Person Supportive and Encouraging..... | 40 |
| 46 | Perspective on Student Characteristics..... | 41 |
| 47 | Perspective on Instructional Methods..... | 41 |
| 48 | Perspective on Important Learning Outcomes..... | 42 |
| 49 | Full-Time/Part-Time..... | 42 |
| 50 | Usefulness of Educational Preparation..... | 46 |
| 51 | Sought a Teaching Position..... | 46 |
| 52 | Regret They Are Not Teaching..... | 47 |
| 53 | Satisfaction With Current Employment..... | 47 |
| 54 | Reasons for Not Teaching..... | 48 |
| 55 | Rating of the Educational Placement Office..... | 48 |
| 56 | Full-Time/Part-Time Employment..... | 55 |
| 57 | Usefulness of Educational Preparation..... | 55 |
| 58 | Sought A Teaching Position..... | 56 |
| 59 | Regret They Are Not Teaching..... | 56 |
| 60 | Satisfaction With Current Employment..... | 57 |
| 61 | Reasons For Not Teaching..... | 57 |
| 62 | Rating of Educational Placement Office..... | 58 |
| 63 | Location of Student Teaching..... | 58 |
| 64 | Classroom Discipline During Student Teaching..... | 61 |
| 65 | Success of Student Teaching Experience..... | 61 |
| 66 | Relationship With Cooperating Teacher..... | 62 |
| 67 | Ability Level of Students During Student Teaching.. | 62 |
| 68 | 1978 - 1979 Identified Curriculum Areas for Increased Emphasis. | 64 |
| 69 | 1980 - 1981 Identified Curriculum Areas for Increased Emphasis. | 65 |
| 70 | 1981 - 1982 Identified Curriculum Areas for Increased Emphasis. | 66 |

# INTRODUCTION

The Follow-up Project of the College of Education has completed studies on samples of first-year teachers since 1977. The information gathered was collected by questionnaire, direct observation and telephone interviews. The results were compiled and reported in annual technical reports.

The follow-up data obtained from the graduates are part of the Student Information System (SIS) developed in the College of Education. This system allows for students to be evaluated from the time they apply to a teacher education program through their first three or four years of teaching. The follow-up data is the last data component collected and entered in the system.

The follow-up study is conducted in part to meet the standards of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Ohio State Department of Education's standards for evaluating teacher education students. The data provides information that enables the College to ascertain the professional status of its graduates. In addition, it assists the College in evaluating and modifying its academic programs.

The following is a detailed report of the process implemented for developing and completing the follow-up studies, during the 1982-83 academic year on graduates of the College of Education.

## Samples

This year the Follow-up Project staff made various changes in implementing the study of graduates of the College of Education. First, three sample years were selected for study as opposed to only one. This decision was made to facilitate accurate comparisons between years and assessment, over time, of satisfaction with job placements, teacher turnover and the identification of other such trends.

Samples were selected from the 1978-1979 graduates, 1980-1981 graduates and the 1981-1982 graduates. The 1978-1979 and 1980-1981 samples were 20 percent random samples stratified by program area; the 1981-1982 sample was the total population. These sample sizes were chosen because first year teachers have traditionally been the population of interest hence, the larger size; in addition, the other two years had been previously surveyed and a sample is sufficient to produce representative responses for the entire population therefore, keeping the cost of the study at a minimum. The samples were stratified by program area based on the fact that the literature has indicated significant differences can be found on various measures by program area and the results will be presented by program area as well as in aggregate form. In those program areas that had five or less in the population, the total number was selected for use in the sample.

The population lists for each year were obtained from The Ohio State University Alumni Office. The Follow-up staff coded each name and then randomly selected the number of students that would yield an appropriate size sample by program area. The sample sizes* were as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1978-1979 | 213 |
| 1980-1981 | 193 |
| 1981-1982 | 961 (entire population) |

Each follow-up questionnaire was assigned a code number for record keeping purposes and to maintain confidentiality. They were mailed on March 14, 1983. Each questionnaire was checked off as it was returned. On April 15, 1983, a follow-up letter and questionnaire were mailed to those subjects who had not responded to the first mailing. The total response rate for each year is:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1978-1979 | 139 | 63% |
| 1980-1981 | 114 | 59% |
| 1981-1982 | 614 | 62% |

Questionnaire Modification

The Follow-up staff examined the questionnaire that had been used in previous years and identified areas for modification. Changes in the wording of certain items were made, some items were eliminated and new items added. Common items were grouped under definite headings to identify the area being addressed by the items. The headings were (1) demographics, (2) current employment, full or part-time, (3) educational background, (4) student teaching, (5) individuals not teaching, (6) individuals teaching, (7) current teaching situation, (8) professional interactions in the school setting, and (9) teaching perspective.

An important addition to the questionnaire was a request, if the student was teaching, to contact his/her supervisor. This will enable the follow-up project staff to gather additional information on ratings of the graduate's teaching competence. After the questionnaire was modified and printed, a coding structure was developed for data entry and statistical analysis. The open-ended questions were content analyzed to construct categories for coding. This was performed by randomly selecting 100 questionnaires and tallying the responses for the open-ended questions. Those responses that occurred five or more times were designated as a category or alternative. The multiple choice items were assigned values to represent an interval scale.

* The population sizes for each year by program area can be found in Appendix I.

## Data Processing

Initially the collected data was being entered on IBM answer sheets to be scanned and then transferred to tape for storage purposes. However, entering the data directly from the forms into the Student Information System was found to be a more efficient method. The data is now stored on the SIS date base. It is transferred to tapes to facilitate statistical analysis and generation of information and reports in a shorter "turn around" period. It can be anticipated to have any requests of follow-up information within a two week period. The transfer of data to tape is done directly to University Systems from the College Information Service, where SIS is maintained, to the Instructional Research Computing Service where the tapes are stored.

## Statistical Analysis and Reporting

In previous years the collected data from the follow-up questionnaire were analyzed primarily by computing frequencies and percentages for each item. From that analysis a profile was developed of the sample and some comparisons made with the previous year. The analysis for this year will be more extensive.

First a chi-square to determine the representativeness of the respondents by program area and sex for each sample year was performed. Descriptive statistics including means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages were produced for each item.

From these results, a description or profile of the students was developed for each sample year. Comparisons between sample years were made and differences examined using analysis of variance techniques. Comparisons were also made between the following groups within each year:

(1) Program Areas

(2) Teaching Level (elementary, secondary)

(3) Sex

(4) Current Employment Subgroups (teaching, education related, noneducation related)

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and hand calculations were used to perform the analysis.

## Organization of the Technical Report

The results of the aforementioned analyses are presented in the following technical report. The format of the report is as follows. First, demographic information and select questionnaire items for each sample year are presented in table form. Based on these tables a profile of each sample year is presented.

The next section contains a discussion of questionnaire items by employment subgroup. Three categories of employment were developed for analysis purposes. The three subgroups are those individuals currently employed in teaching including full-time classroom teachers and permanent substitutes; those individuals employed in an education related field; and those employed in a noneducation-related field. The subgroups are discussed for each sample year, and differences within those years by program area, sex, and teaching level are presented. Finally, a comparison between years of each subgroup is presented.

The next section deals with comparisons between the subgroups, i.e., is there a difference between individuals teaching and individuals employed in the noneducational field on how they rate the usefulness of their educational preparation?

The final section contains a discussion of a group of items regarding the student teaching experience and a group of items dealing with the educational background of the respondents. This group of items is discussed by each sample year.

Finally, the appendices contain the Follow-up Questionnaire answered by the graduates, and the two informational letters mailed with the questionnaire. The statistical analyses that produced significant results can also be found in the appendices.

## PROFILE OF SAMPLE YEARS

### 1978-1979

The final 1978-1979 sample consisted of 135 completed and useable questionnaires. This sample represents those persons who have graduated from the College of Education four years ago. A chi-square analysis demonstrated that the sample was representative of the sex variable (see Table 2) but not the program area variable (see Table 1). By examining the contribution of each program area to the chi-square (Table 1), it was evident that nonrepresentativeness on program area was due to the over representation of small program areas. As stated in the previous section, total population numbers from the smaller program areas were used in the sample. Therefore, when using the data the reader should consider the fact that the smaller program areas have a proportionally greater contribution to the sample results than they would in the population. The nonrepresentativeness of the sample on the program area variable means that the results can be generalized to the sample with confidence, but to the population with caution. As will be seen later, the impact of this on the conclusions of the findings appear to be minimal.

The data collected from the completed questionnaires from the 1978-1979 sample yield the following profile. The reported percentages are based on those individuals that responded to the item and not the entire sample, i.e. the missing values were not included in the calculation of the percentage values. Therefore, the percentages are based on slightly different sample sizes for each item (see Tables 7 through 18). The majority of the graduates are:

-- females (63%)

-- presently 26-30 years of age (85%)

-- Caucasian (94%)

-- currently employed (89%)

-- employed in a full-time capacity (91%)

-- employed in teaching (48%)

-- have taught four or more years (31%)

-- somewhat or very satisfied with their current employment (83%)

TABLE 1

1978-1979

Chi-Square By Program Area

| Program Area | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 21 | 23 | 24 | 26 | 27 | 28 | Combined* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Contribution Observed | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 34 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 7 | 13 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 19 |
| Contribution Expected | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 42 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 9 | 11 | 7 | 3 | 14 | 7 |
| Contribution To Chi-Square | 0 | 1.8 | | | | .8 | | 1.5 | .8 | .25 | 0 | | 0 | .8 | .33 | .44 | .36 | 1.2 | 8.33 | 2.57 | 20.57 |

* Groups 3, 4, 5, 8, 11, 29, and 30 all had expected frequencies of 1.

$X^2 = 39.85$; df = 16; Table Value = 26.30; $p \leq .05$

TABLE 2

Chi-Square By Sex

| Sex | MALE | FEMALE |
|---|---|---|
| Frequency Observed | 49 | 85 |
| Frequency Expected | 47 | 87 |
| Contribution To Chi-Square | .085 | .046 |

$X^2 = .131$; df = 1; Table Value = 3.84; $p \leq .05$

In addition, the majority:

-- completed their entire four years at OSU (91%)

-- were elementary education majors (25%)

-- found their educational preparation to be useful in their current employment (93%)

-- intend to engage in further professional study in the education field (53%)

1980-1981

The total respondents for the 1980-1981 sample totaled 114. This sample represents those persons who graduated from the College of Education two years ago. The subsequent chi-square analyses demonstrated that the sample was representative of the population on the sex variable (Table 4), and the program area variable (Table 3).

The resulting profile from the 1980-1981 sample is as follows. The majority of the graduates are:

-- female (72%)

-- presently 20-25 years of age (72%)

-- Caucasian (94%)

-- currently employed (91%)

-- employed in a full-time capacity (83%)

-- employed in teaching (38%) or a noneducation field (38%)

-- have not taught a complete year (52%)

-- somewhat or very satisfied with their current employment (77%)

-- completed their entire four years at OSU (80%)

-- were elementary education majors (33%)

-- found their educational preparation useful in their current employment (92%)

-- intend to engage in further professional study in the education field (54%)

(See Tables 7 through 18.)

TABLE 3

1980-1981

Chi-Square By Program Area

| Program Area | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 21 | 23 | 24 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | Combined* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Frequency Observed | 3 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 37 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 27 |
| Frequency Expected | 5 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 41 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 9 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 13 |
| Contribution To Chi-Square | .80 | .20 | - | - | - | .20 | | .39 | .8 | .67 | - | - | - | 0 | .33 | | 0 | 0 | - | 14 | - | - | 15.07 |

* Groups 3, 5, 6, 8, 13, 15, 16, 21, 27, 29, and 30 were combined because their expected frequencies were less than 2.

$X^2 = 18.60$; df = 11; Table Value = 19.68; $p \leq .05$

TABLE 4

Chi-Square By Sex

| Sex | MALE | FEMALE |
|---|---|---|
| Frequency Observed | 32 | 82 |
| Frequency Expected | 32 | 82 |
| Contribution To Chi-Square | 0 | 0 |

$X^2 = 0$ ; df = 1; Table Value = 3.84; $p \leq .05$

1981-1982

The total respondents for the 1981-1982 sample numbered 614. This sample represents first year graduates of the College of Education. The chi-square analysis for representativeness demonstrated that this sample was representative of the original population on both the sex and program area variables. (See Tables 5 and 6.)

The resulting profile from the 1981-1982 respondents is as follows (see Tables 7 through 18). The majority of the graduates are:

-- female (78%)

-- presently 20-25 years of age (77%)

-- Caucasian (97%)

-- currently employed (98%)

-- employed in a full-time capacity (68%)

-- employed in teaching (34%)

-- have not taught a complete year (63%)

-- somewhat or very satisfied with their current employment (68%)

-- completed their entire four years at OSU (74%)

-- elementary education majors (40%)

-- found their educational preparation to be useful in their present employment (92%)

-- intended to engage in further professional study in the educational field (56%)

On each of the tables a total sample size and percent was listed. This is an unweighted sum of all responses across the three sample years. As will be seen later, because there are negligible differences across the responses from sample years, the unweighted total column presents a reasonably accurate picture of all respondents.

TABLE 5

1981-1982

Chi-Square By Program Area

| Program Area | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 21 | 23 | 24 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 30 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Frequency Observed | 23 | 19 | 3 | 16 | 28 | 3 | 246 | 38 | 2 | 27 | 10 | 12 | 22 | 14 | 4 | 35 | 45 | 22 | 6 | 30 | 4 |
| Frequency Expected | 18 | 24 | 1 | 12 | 24 | 6 | 250 | 31 | 2 | 25 | 6 | 6 | 18 | 12 | 6 | 37 | 49 | 31 | 6 | 37 | 6 |
| Contribution To Chi-Square | 1.39 | 1.04 | 4 | 1.33 | .67 | 1.5 | .06 | 1.58 | 0 | .16 | 2.67 | 6 | .89 | .33 | .67 | .11 | .33 | 2.61 | 0 | 1.32 | .67 |

$X^2 = 27.33$; df = 20; Table Value = 31.41; $p \leq .05$

TABLE 6

Chi-Square By Sex

| Sex | MALE | FEMALE |
|---|---|---|
| Frequency Observed | 137 | 473 |
| Frequency Expected | 159 | 451 |
| Contribution To Chi-Square | 3.04 | 1.07 |

$X^2 = 4.04$; df = 1; Table Value = 3.84; $p \leq .05$

TABLE 7

PROGRAM AREA

| | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | TOTAL | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| AGRICULTURE | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 23 | 4 | 31 | 3.6 |
| ART | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 19 | 3 | 25 | 2.9 |
| BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 6 | .7 |
| BROADCAST COMMUNICATION | 1 | 1 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 1 | .1 |
| BUSINESS EDUCATION | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 16 | 3 | 22 | 2.6 |
| DANCE EDUCATION | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | - | 1 | .1 |
| DENTAL HYGIENE | 3 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 28 | 5 | 37 | 4.3 |
| DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 8 | .9 |
| ELEMENTARY EDUCATION | 34 | 25 | 37 | 33 | 246 | 40 | 317 | 37.0 |
| ELEMENTARY-SPECIAL ED | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 12 | 1.4 |
| ENGLISH EDUCATION | 7 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 38 | 6 | 49 | 5.7 |
| ENGLISH COMMUNICATION | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | .3 | 5 | .6 |
| EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN | 2 | 2 | 0 | - | 21 | 3 | 23 | 2.7 |
| FOREIGN LANGUAGE | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 10 | 2 | 17 | 2.0 |
| HEALTH EDUCATION | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 12 | 2 | 21 | 2.5 |
| HOME ECONOMICS | 7 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 22 | 4 | 32 | 3.7 |
| INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY | 7 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 14 | 2 | 25 | 2.9 |
| MATHEMATICS | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 1.1 |
| MUSIC EDUCATION | 7 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 35 | 6 | 49 | 5.7 |
| PHYSICAL EDUCATION | 13 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 45 | 7 | 67 | 7.8 |
| RECREATION EDUCATION | 4 | 3 | 0 | - | 22 | 4 | 26 | 3.0 |
| SCIENCE EDUCATION | 8 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 16 | 1.9 |
| SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION | 8 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 30 | 5 | 44 | 5.1 |
| SPEECH-THEATRE EDUCATION | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | - | 3 | .4 |
| TRADE AND INDUSTRIAL EDUC | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 10 | 1.2 |
| TOTAL | 134 | 101 * | 113 | 104 | 609 | 99* | 856 | 100.0 |

*Rounding error

TABLE 8
Sex

| Subgroup: All | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (2) Male | 49 | 37 | 32 | 28 | 137 | 23 | 218 | 25 |
| (1) Female | 85 | 63 | 82 | 72 | 473 | 78 | 640 | 75 |
| Total | 134 | 100 | 114 | 100 | 610 | 101* | 858 | 100 |
| Mean | 1.39 | | 1.28 | | 1.22 | | 1.26 | |
| Standard Deviation | .53 | | .45 | | .42 | | .45 | |

*Rounding error

TABLE 9
Age

| Subgroup: All | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (1) 20-25 | 36 | 27 | 82 | 72 | 471 | 77 | 589 | 69 |
| (2) 26-30 | 85 | 63 | 20 | 18 | 64 | 11 | 169 | 20 |
| (3) 31-35 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 38 | 6 | 54 | 6 |
| (4) 36-40 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 20 | 3 | 24 | 3 |
| (5) over 40 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 18 | 3 | 24 | 3 |
| Total | 135 | 101* | 114 | 101* | 611 | 100 | 860 | 101* |

*Rounding error

TABLE 10
Race

| Subgroup: All | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (1) Asian American | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 8 | 1 |
| (2) Black Non-Hispanic | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 2 | 18 | 2 |
| (3) Hispanic | 1 | 1 | 0 | -- | 2 | .3 | 3 | .4 |
| (5) White | 127 | 94 | 107 | 94 | 590 | 97 | 824 | 96 |
| (6) Other | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | .3 | 5 | .6 |
| Total | 135 | 101* | 115 | 101* | 608 | 101* | 858 | 99* |

*Rounding error

TABLE 11
Currently Employed or Unemployed

| Subgroup: All | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (1) Yes | 119 | 89 | 103 | 91 | 562 | 92 | 784 | 92 |
| (2) No | 15 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 47 | 8 | 72 | 8 |
| Total | 134 | 100 | 113 | 100 | 609 | 100 | 856 | 100 |
| Mean | 1.11 | | 1.11 | | 1.09 | | 1.10 | |
| Standard Deviation | .32 | | .39 | | .35 | | .35 | |

TABLE 12
Full-Time/Part-Time

| Subgroup: All | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (2) Full-time | 109 | 91 | 85 | 83 | 384 | 68 | 578 | 74 |
| (1) Part-time | 11 | 9 | 18 | 18 | 177 | 32 | 206 | 26 |
| Total | 120 | 100 | 103 | 101* | 561 | 100 | 784 | 100 |
| Mean | 1.91 | | 1.83 | | 1.68 | | 1.74 | |
| Standard Deviation | .29 | | .38 | | .47 | | .44 | |

*Rounding error

TABLE 13
Type of Current Employment

| Subgroup: All | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (1) Classroom Teacher | 54 | 45 | 37 | 36 | 169 | 30 | 260 | 33 |
| (2) Other School Employment | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 1 | 16 | 2 |
| (3) Post-Secondary | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 10 | 1 |
| (4) Permanent Substitute | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 24 | 4 | 29 | 4 |
| (5) Day to Day Substitue | 2 | 2 | 11 | 11 | 119 | 21 | 132 | 17 |
| (6) Education Related | 17 | 14 | 8 | 8 | 55 | 10 | 80 | 10 |
| (7) Noneducation-related | 39 | 32 | 39 | 38 | 182 | 32 | 260 | 33 |
| Total | 120 | 101* | 103 | 101* | 564 | 99* | 787 | 100 |

*Rounding error

TABLE 14
Usefulness of Educational Preparation

| Subgroup: All | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (3) Very Useful | 57 | 48 | 45 | 44 | 244 | 44 | 346 | 44 |
| (2) Somewhat Useful | 54 | 45 | 49 | 48 | 251 | 45 | 354 | 45 |
| (1) Not Useful | 9 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 66 | 12 | 83 | 11 |
| Total | 120 | 101* | 102 | 100 | 561 | 101* | 783 | 100 |
| Mean | 2.40 | | 2.36 | | 2.32 | | 2.34 | |
| Standard Deviation | .63 | | .63 | | .67 | | .66 | |

*Rounding error

TABLE 15
Consideration of Further Professional Study

| Subgroup: All | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (1) Masters, Education | 58 | 45 | 49 | 46 | 283 | 48 | 390 | 47 |
| (2) Doctorate, Education | 5 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 1 |
| (3) Specialist, Education | 5 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 39 | 7 | 50 | 6 |
| (4) Non-educational Field | 34 | 26 | 24 | 23 | 136 | 23 | 194 | 24 |
| (5) No Further Study | 28 | 22 | 25 | 24 | 130 | 22 | 183 | 22 |
| Total | 130 | 101* | 106 | 101* | 591 | 101* | 827 | 100 |

*Rounding error

TABLE 16
Whether or Not Student Transferred

| Subgroup: All | 1978-1979 N | 1978-1979 % | 1980-1981 N | 1980-1981 % | 1981-1982 N | 1981-1982 % | Total N | Total % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (6) No, Completed entire four years at OSU | 102 | 76 | 91 | 80 | 454 | 74 | 647 | 75 |
| (5) Yes, Entered as a Freshman | 7 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 21 | 3 | 31 | 4 |
| (4) Yes, Entered as a Sophomore | 15 | 11 | 12 | 11 | 61 | 10 | 88 | 10 |
| (3) Yes, Entered as a Junior | 10 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 51 | 8 | 66 | 8 |
| (2) Yes, Entered as a Senior | 0 | -- | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 8 | 1 |
| (1) Other | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 17 | 3 | 20 | 2 |
| Total | 135 | 100 | 114 | 101* | 611 | 99* | 860 | 100 |

*Rounding error

TABLE 17
Satisfaction with Current Employment

| Subgroup: All | 1978-1979 N | 1978-1979 % | 1980-1981 N | 1980-1981 % | 1981-1982 N | 1981-1982 % | Total N | Total % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (5) Very Satisfied | 57 | 48 | 37 | 36 | 195 | 35 | 289 | 37 |
| (4) Somewhat Satisfied | 42 | 35 | 40 | 39 | 183 | 33 | 265 | 34 |
| (3) Neutral | 10 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 61 | 11 | 77 | 10 |
| (2) Somewhat Dissatisfied | 7 | 6 | 14 | 14 | 83 | 15 | 104 | 13 |
| (1) Very Dissatisfied | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 40 | 7 | 49 | 6 |
| Total | 120 | 100 | 102 | 100 | 562 | 101* | 784 | 100 |
| Mean | 4.18 | | 3.88 | | 3.73 | | 3.82 | |
| Standard Deviation | 1.03 | | 1.19 | | 1.27 | | 1.24 | |

*Rounding error

TABLE 18

Years of Teaching

| Subgroup: All | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (1) None | 34 | 27 | 56 | 52 | 366 | 63 | 456 | 56 |
| (2) One | 13 | 10 | 14 | 13 | 191 | 33 | 218 | 27 |
| (3) Two | 20 | 16 | 34 | 32 | 15 | 3 | 69 | 8 |
| (4) Three | 20 | 16 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 25 | 3 |
| (5) Four or More | 39 | 31 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 45 | 6 |
| Total | 126 | 100 | 108 | 101* | 579 | 101* | 813 | 100 |
| Mean | 3.13 | | 1.88 | | 1.42 | | 1.75 | |
| Standard Deviation | 1.61 | | 1.00 | | .64 | | 1.10 | |

*Rounding error

TABLE 19

Employed In Major or Minor Field

| Subgroup: Teaching | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (1) Employed in Major Field | 44 | 77 | 34 | 87 | 158 | 82 | 236 | 82 |
| (2) Employed in Minor Field | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 5 | 13 | 4 |
| (3) Employed in Major and Minor Field | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 12 | 4 |
| (4) Employed in Other Education Field | 9 | 16 | 3 | 8 | 16 | 8 | 28 | 10 |
| Total | 57 | 101* | 39 | 101* | 193 | 100 | 289 | 100 |

*Rounding error

## COMPARISONS BY SAMPLE YEAR

Examination of the profiles and tables for each sample year demonstrates very little difference between the sample years on these select variables. Statistical analysis supports this observation. Analyses of variance produced only three significant differences on the 13 selected variables which made up the profiles. (See Appendices C.)

The significant differences were found on the sex, full-time/part-time employment, and satisfaction with current employment variables. These significant differences indicate that more males have graduated in the College of Education each year, and there was a significant increase in the male graduates between the 1978-1979 sample and the 1981-1982 sample. The increase in male graduates was a progressive increase from sample year to sample year. (See Appendix 1C.)

The second significant difference indicates that although a large percentage of graduates have found employment each year, the percentage of those that are employed full-time is less each year from the 1978-1979 sample year to the 1981-1982 sample year. A plausible explanation for this difference is that the longer an individual is out of college the more likely he is to find full-time employment. (See Appendix 2C.)

The final significant difference between the 1978-1979 and 1981-1982 samples indicates that the graduates that have been out of college the longest are the most satisfied with their current employment. It would appear that the older graduates have had more time to select employment that would be more satisfying to them. (See Appendix 3C.)

## TEACHING

The respondents that identified themselves as classroom teachers and permanent substitutes comprise the employment subgroup teaching. For each sample year they represent 48 percent (N = 57), 38 percent (N = 39), 34 percent (N = 193), respectively. The discussion for each sample year will be divided into five categories (1) method of obtaining employment in teaching; (2) description of current teaching position; (3) measures of performance, i.e. effectiveness, confidence, etc.; (4) professional interaction in the school setting; and (5) teaching perspective.

### 1978-1979 Sample

#### Method of Obtaining Employment

The discussion contained in this category revolves around the responses to five questionnaire items that address how graduates went about seeking employment and a brief description of their employment status. The items include (1) whether or not graduates are employed in their major or minor field; (2) whether they are full or part-time employees; (3) what was the most helpful strategy for securing employment; (4) how was their first teaching position obtained; and (5) how they rated the services of the placement office. (See Tables 19 through 23.)

In the 1978-1979 teaching subgroup, 77 percent of the respondents are employed in their major field and an overwhelming majority (97%) are full-time teachers. When seeking employment the respondents felt that personal initiative (81%) was the one most important strategy for securing employment. They identified a personal contact as the primary method for obtaining their first teaching position (33%). In regard to the placement office services, a small percentage (23%) of the respondents did not use the services. The ratings of good and fair were the most frequent ratings with 30 percent of the respondents selecting each.

#### Description of Current Teaching Position

The locations of the current positions of these respondents are equally divided between urban, suburban, and rural communities. The majority (58%) are teaching at the senior high school level. The schools are predominately small in size, 50 percent have less than 500 students, and are predominately Caucasian, 65 percent have less than 5 percent minority students. The students that are being taught by the respondents were rated as having average motivation (66%). Ratings of the current classroom discipline indicated that very few teachers (6%) had many discipline problems; the greatest number (71%) indicated they had occasional discipline problems in the classroom. (See Tables 24 through 29.)

## Measures of Performance

The majority of the individuals teaching (88%) were satisfied or somewhat satisfied with their jobs. Their feelings toward the teaching position are generally positive (56%) or very positive (24%). They rated their educational preparation as very useful (61%) or somewhat useful (37%) in their teaching positions. Regarding their preparation for the responsibilities of teaching, 46 percent stated they were well prepared for the majority of teaching responsibilities; 39 percent felt they were generally prepared. They are extremely confident about their teaching; 73 percent rated themselves as extremely confident and an additional 25 percent as somewhat confident. They also rated their teaching as moderately (51%) or very effective (49%). The most popular way teachers felt their effectiveness could be improved is by having fewer or smaller classes (33%). The next highest choice was more lesson preparation time (18%) and more support from other school personnel (18%). (See Tables 30 through 36.)

## Professional Interaction in the School Setting

Within the school environment various interactions that take place were evaluated. The availability of assistance with discipline problems was generally rated as available and effective (55%). It should also be noted that the next highest rating (14%) was that assistance was available but ineffective.

The topic of extracurricular activities revealed that the majority of the teachers (73%) believed supervision of extracurricular activities was voluntary. Yet, 25 percent believed it was expected, but not required. Fifty-four percent of the teachers responding did supervise extracurricular activities, and 52 percent of those received pay for this additional responsibility.

Evaluation of the teachers performance was overwhelmingly (91%) performed by a principal or school administrator. This evaluation took place, most often, two to three times a year (41%). Also, 29 percent said they were evaluated once a year. Although formal evaluation occurs, teachers feel the most meaningful forms of evaluation are student improvement (40%) and students' feedback (25%).

For help in professional development, and support, and encouragement during the first year of teaching, a fellow teacher was noted as the primary source. Sixty-six percent selected a teaching colleague in the latter category and 17 percent selected a friend or relative. For assistance in professional development, 58 percent chose a teaching colleague and 19 percent selected an administrator. (See Tables 37 through 45.)

## Teaching Perspective

The respondents' perspectives on three teaching beliefs were measured: (1) whether they view students as dependent on the teacher for direction or independent and capable of self-direction; (2) what they view as the most important learning outcomes; and (3) the appropriate selection and implementation of methods of instruction. A respondent could be directive or nondirective in his/her perspective. In general, the directive perspective is represented by a belief in firm teacher control over student behavior and the learning activities of the classroom. The nondirective perspective is represented by the belief that teachers should provide opportunities for student control over their own behavior and learning activities. The teachers' perspectives were primarily directive in beliefs about student characteristics and methods of instruction with 80% and 66%, respectively, selecting responses on the directive side of the continuum. The opposite was true of important learning outcomes with 79% selecting nondirective responses. Overall, only 8% and 7% of respondents indicated extreme directive and nondirective positions. Of the two middle positions, 48% selected the directive emphasis while 38% selected the nondirective emphasis. (See Tables 46 through 48.)

## Comparisons on Program Area, Teaching Level and Sex

Analysis of the teaching subgroup to determine differences between program areas, levels of teaching and sex were performed utilizing the analysis of variance technique (Appendices D). Three significant differences were found by program area. They were teaching level (Appendix 1.1D), supervision in extra curricular activities (Appendix 1.2D), and the person most helpful in professional development (Appendix 1.3D). Response values on the teaching level variable were 1 for elementary, 2 for junior high school, and 3 for senior high school. The means for this variable ranged from 1 to 3. The response values for the item regarding whether or not a teacher participated in extracurricular activities were 1 for yes and 2 for no; the range of means was from 1 to 2. The responses for the item dealing with identifying the individual that was most helpful for professional development were 1 for administrator; 2 for teaching colleague; 3 for department head; 4 for counselor; and 5 for other. The mean responses for the program areas ranged from 1 to 5. There were no significant differences between any two program areas on any of these items.

The sex variable produced two significant differences. These two differences were found on the following questionnaire items: (1) classroom discipline (Appendix 1.4D); (2) teaching effectiveness (Appendix 1.5D). The classroom discipline item had the following three responses and corresponding values: (1) no problems -- 1; (2) occasional problems -- 2; and (3) many problems -- 3. The teaching effectiveness item's responses and values were as follows: 1 for ineffective; 2 for somewhat effective; 3 for moderately effective; and 4 for very effective. Female teachers (mean = 1.91) reported more classroom discipline problems than males (mean - 1.60). Yet, females (mean = 3.64) rated their teaching as more effective than males (mean = 3.24).

The teaching level produced a significant difference between elementary and senior high school on the size of the school variable (Appendix 1.6D). The size of school item's responses and their values are 1 for under 500, 2 for 500-1000, and 3 for over 1000. Elementary schools (mean = 1.15) were significantly smaller than senior high schools (mean = 1.94).

## 1980-1981 Sample

### Method of Obtaining Employment

The 1980-1981 sample of teachers has 87 percent employed in their major field of study with 95 percent in a full-time capacity. Thirty-one percent found their first teaching position through a personal contact. Like the previous sample, the majority (59%) rated personal initiative as the most helpful method for securing employment. Twenty-six percent did not use the placement office's services, but 51 percent rated it as good or excellent. (See Tables 19 through 23.)

### Description of Current Teaching Position

The locations of the teachers' positions are not as evenly divided as the previous sample year but the differences are not that great. Thirty-seven percent are teaching in a rural community, 34 percent are in a suburban setting and 28 percent are in an urban setting. Teachers are employed in schools that generally enroll under 500 students (56%); but 31 percent are in schools that have 500-1000 students. These schools (80%) have less than 5 percent minority students in attendance. Again, the majority of the teachers (54%) are teaching at the senior high school level. The students are of average motivation (59%) and present only occasional classroom discipline problems (64%). (See Tables 24 through 29).

### Measures of Performance

The majority of the teachers (88%) are somewhat or very satisfied with their teaching positions. Accordingly, 86 percent have positive or very positive feelings toward teaching. They have rated their educational preparation as somewhat or very useful (100%) in their teaching positions. As a group they feel they were well prepared to face their teaching responsibilities; 72 percent rated themselves as generally or well prepared for the majority of the teaching responsibilities and an additional 26 percent said they were well prepared for all of the responsibilities. Accordingly, 97 percent said they were somewhat or extremely confident in carrying out these responsibilities; 93 percent rated themselves as moderately or very effective teachers. Like the previous sample, they felt their effectiveness could be improved by having fewer or smaller classes (27%) and having increased lesson preparation time (24%). (See Tables 30 through 36).

## Professional Interaction in the School Setting

In rating the availability of assistance with discipline problems, the majority of the teachers (56%) said it was available and effective. The next highest rating (15%) was the availability of assistance in extreme circumstances.

Involvement in extracurricular activities was generally viewed as voluntary (55%); an additional 34 percent felt it was expected but not required. Fifty-nine percent of the teachers did supervise an activity and 75 percent of those supervising are paid for their efforts.

The evaluation of these teachers was performed primarily by a principal or school administrator (85%), usually two to three times a year (50%). The teachers feel that the most meaningful evaluation methods for them are student improvement (41%) and students' feedback (24%).

As in the 1978-1979 sample, the respondents selected a fellow teacher as the person most helpful in their professional development (54%) and most supportive and encouraging during their first year of teaching (41%). Also, on the latter item an administrator was selected by 19 percent of the teachers. (See Tables 37 through 45.)

## Teaching Perspective

The teachers' perspectives were primarily directive in their view of student characteristics (64%), but nondirective in important learning outcomes (54%) and methods of instruction (54%). Overall, 6 percent and 14 percent indicated extreme directive and nondirective positions, while 46 percent and 33 percent indicated an emphasis on directive and nondirective perspectives. (See Tables 46 through 48.)

## Comparisons on Program Area, Teaching Level, and Sex

The analyses to ascertain differences by program area, teaching level, and sex produced significant results on each variable. By program area, overall differences were found on size of the school (appendix 2.1D), teaching level (Appendix 2.2D) and expectations for supervision of extracurricular activities (Appendix 2.3D). The response values for the school size item were 1 for under 500; 2 for 500-1000; and 3 for over 1000. The mean responses ranged from 1 to 5. The response values for the teaching level item were 1 for elementary; 2 for junior high; and 3 for senior high. The mean responses for the program areas ranged from 1 to 3. The response item dealing with expectations for supervising extracurricular activities had the following response values: 1 for voluntary; 2 for expected; 3 for required; and 4 for a condition of employment. The range of mean responses was from 1 to 4. There was a difference found on the employment in major or minor field item, between health education with a mean response of 4 and elementary education with a mean response of 1. There was also a significant difference between social studies education with a mean response of 1 and elementary education with a mean response of 4 on the same item.

Although statistically these were significant differences, they are questionable for any practical purposes because the sample size for both social studies and health education was 1.

However, the sex variable produced the most differences. These differences demonstrated that there are more males in larger schools (mean = 1.92; female mean - 1.41) (Appendix 2.4D) and closely related to this finding, there are more males teaching in junior and senior high schools (mean = 2.77; female mean = 1.92) (Appendix 2.5D). Males also felt that extracurricular activities were expected (mean - 2.07) whereas females viewed them as being voluntary (mean = 1.30) (Appendix 2.70). Significantly more males mean = 1.07) than females (mean = 1.58) supervised extracurricular activities (Appendix 2.80). Finally, females rated themselves more effective (mean = 3.62) than the male teachers (mean = 3.15) (Appendix 2.6D).

## 1981-1982 Sample

### Method of Obtaining Employment

The 1981-1982 teaching subgroup contained 193 teachers. The majority of them (82%) was employed in their major field and an additional five percent were employed in their major and minor fields. Eighty-nine percent are full-time teachers. As with the two previous samples, these teachers (66%) felt personal initiative was the most helpful method for securing employment, and 30 percent stated they obtained their first teaching position through a personal contact. In addition, 24 percent obtained their first job through the placement office. Seventy-one percent of the teachers used the placement office, and 48 percent rated its services good or excellent. (See Tables 19 through 23.)

### Description of Current Teaching Position

The location of the teachers in this sample is primarily in a rural community (44%), the next largest setting is suburban (35%) and the urban setting has 21 percent of the teachers. The schools are predominately (54%) small in size and are senior high schools (54%). The schools' student populations are less than 5 percent minority students (75%). Fifty-two percent of the teachers rated their students' motivational level as average. The teachers overwhelmingly (71%) stated that they had occasional classroom discipline problems. (See Tables 24 through 29.)

## Measures of Performance

The majority (85%) of the teachers is somewhat or very satisfied with teaching, and 82 percent have positive or very positive feelings toward teaching. The teachers (98%) have found their educational preparation somewhat or very useful in their jobs, and 77 percent of them feel they were generally or well prepared for the majority of the teaching responsibilities. An additional 20 percent felt they were well prepared for all teaching responsibilities. Ninety-five percent felt somewhat or extremely confident in carrying out their teaching responsibilities. Similarly, 98 percent feel their teaching is moderately or very effective. Yet, like the other two samples, they feel their effectiveness could be improved by having fewer or smaller classes (30%) and more time for lesson preparation (27%). (See Tables 30 through 36.)

## Professional Interaction in the School Setting

The availability of assistance with discipline problems was rated similarly to the two previous samples. Sixty-seven percent rated their assistance as available and effective and 14 percent felt it was ineffective.

The teachers' view of what was expected of them in regard to supervising extracurricular activities was predominately (67%) voluntary. An additional 20 percent felt it was expected of them. Fifty-four percent do supervise extracurricular activities, and 58 percent of them are paid for supervising these activities.

Evaluation of the teachers' performance is performed by a principal or school administrator (81%). Fifty-seven percent are evaluated two to three times a year; 14 percent are evaluated four to six times a year. The teachers feel the most valuable evaluation methods are student improvement (44%) and student feedback (17%). An additional 12 percent feel self-evaluation is a meaningful method.

A teaching colleague and an administrator, in that order, were selected as the most supportive and encouraging person during the first year of teaching and most helpful people in professional development. In addition, a relative or friend was selected by 24 percent of the teachers as a supportive and encouraging individual. (See Tables 37 through 45.)

## Teaching Perspective

The teachers' perspectives were primarily directive in their view of student characteristics (74%) and selecting and implementing methods of instruction (63%), but nondirective in important learning outcomes (75%). Overall, 10 percent and 11 percent, respectively, indicated extreme directive and nondirective perspectives. (See Tables 46 through 48.)

Comparisons on Program Area, Teaching Level, and Sex

The analyses to ascertain differences using the one-way analysis of variance technique produced a number of differences by the program area, teaching level and sex variables. Using program area, seven overall differences between program areas were identified. They include size of school, teaching level, satisfaction with current employment, teaching perspective on students, expectations for supervising extracurricular activities, supervision of extracurricular activities and placement office ratings (Appendices 3.1D to 3.7D). To limit repetitious information, only the response values of those items that have not been previously described will be presented in the remainder of the report. The item satisfaction with current employment had the following response values: 1 for very dissatisfied; 2 for somewhat dissatisfied; 3 for neutral; 4 for somewhat satisfied; and 5 for very satisfied. The three items dealing with teaching perspective had the following response values: 1 for strongly agree with position A; 2 for an emphasis on position A along with some elements of position B; 3 for an emphasis on position B along with some elements of A; and 4 for strongly agree with B. The first response values 1 and 2 represent a directive nature whereas response values 3 and 4 represent a nondirective nature. The teaching level item was the only one that produced a significant difference between two specific program areas: elementary education (mean = 1.72) and agricultural education (mean = 3.00); and English education (mean = 3.00), and elementary education (Appendix 3.2D).

On the teaching level variable ten more differences were identified. Seven of the questionnaire items had significant differences between elementary teachers and senior high school teachers. Elementary teachers rated their students as more highly motivated (mean = 2.25) than senior high teachers rated their students (mean = 1.83) (Appendix 3.15D). The teaching perspective on methods of instruction was more directive in nature for elementary teachers (mean = 2.60) than for senior high school teachers (mean = 2.20); the same was true of the teaching perspective on student work behavior (Appendices 3.19D and 3.20D). There was a significant difference between the size of elementary (mean = 1.35) and senior high schools (mean = 1.81); high schools have significantly more students (Appendix 3.16D). High school teachers rated supervision of extracurricular activities as being expected (mean = 1.74) or required whereas elementary teachers generally rated it as being voluntary (mean = 1.28) (Appendix 3.22D). Also, elementary teachers (mean = 4.59) were significantly more satisfied with teaching than senior high teachers (mean = 4.11) although both groups responded with favorable positions. Finally, the rating of the placement office was significantly higher for senior high teachers (mean = 3.32) than elementary teachers (mean = 2.38) (Appendices 3.18D and 3.24D).

Other differences by the teaching level variable include (1) ratings of teaching effectiveness: elementary teachers (mean = 3.65) rated themselves significantly more effective than either junior high (mean = 3.32) or senior high teachers (mean = 3.34) (Appendix 3.17D); (2) teaching perspective on learning outcomes: elementary teachers (mean = 3.18) were less directive than junior high teachers (mean = 2.59) and junior high teachers were less directive than senior high teachers (mean = 2.97) (Appendix 3.20D); and (3) supervision of extracurricular activities: fewer elementary teachers (mean = 1.86) than either junior high (mean = 1.56) or senior high teachers (mean = 1.21) supervised extra-curricular activities and fewer junior high than senior high teachers supvervised extracurricular activities (Appendix 3.23D).

Seven significant differences were found by sex. There are more female teachers at the elementary level (mean = 2.11) and more males at the junior and senior high levels (mean = 2.74) (Appendix 3.9D). Female teachers rated their students as more motivated (mean = 2.08) than male teachers (mean = 1.72) (Appendix 3.8D), also females rated themselves as more effective (mean = 3.47) than males (mean = 3.27) (Appendix 3.10D). On teaching perspectives on students and methods of instruction, females (means = 2.26 and 2.47 respectively) are less directive than males (means = 1.78 and 1.91 respectively) (Appendices 3.11D and 3.12D). It was found that more males supervise extracurricular activities (mean = 1.21) than females (mean = 1.53) (Appendix 3.13D). Finally, males (mean = 3.5) rated the placement office services higher than females rated them ( mean = 2.9) (Appendix 3.14D).

## Comparisons Across Sample Years

The analysis to determine differences between the subgroup teaching by each sample year produced only two significant differences. The teachers in the 1978-1979 sample were significantly more confident (mean = 3.72) than the teachers in the 1981-1982 sample (mean = 3.45) (Appendix 4.2D). The other item which produced a significant difference was the number of times per year evaluation was done. The teachers who had graduated in 1979 were evaluated significantly fewer times per year (mean = 2.53) than the 1982 graduates (mean = 3.11) (Appendix 4.1D). This limited number of significant differences indicates that the teachers who responded to the questionnaire are basically the same. Therefore, the data can be combined to produce meaningful and valid analysis and discussion.

TABLE 20

Full-Time/Part-Time Employment

| Subgroup: Teaching | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (2) Full-time | 35 | 97 | 37 | 95 | 171 | 89 | 263 | 91 |
| (1) Part-time | 2 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 22 | 11 | 26 | 9 |
| Total | 57 | 101* | 39 | 100 | 193 | 100 | 289 | 100 |

*Rounding error

TABLE 21

Most Helpful Method For Securing Employment

| Subgroup: Teaching | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (1) Education Faculty Member | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 12 | 4 |
| (2) Department Chairperson | 1 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 4 | 12 | 4 |
| (3) Placement Office | 6 | 11 | 3 | 8 | 29 | 15 | 38 | 13 |
| (4) Personal Initiative | 46 | 81 | 23 | 59 | 126 | 66 | 195 | 68 |
| (5) Other | 3 | 5 | 8 | 21 | 19 | 10 | 30 | 10 |
| Total | 57 | 101* | 39 | 101* | 191 | 100 | 287 | 99* |

*Rounding error

TABLE 22

Method for Obtaining First Position

| Subgroup: Teaching | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (1) Student Taught There | 6 | 11 | 3 | 8 | 15 | 8 | 24 | 8 |
| (2) Began as a Substitute | 8 | 14 | 6 | 15 | 22 | 12 | 36 | 13 |
| (3) Personal Contact | 19 | 33 | 12 | 31 | 57 | 30 | 88 | 31 |
| (4) Placement Office | 6 | 11 | 6 | 15 | 45 | 24 | 57 | 20 |
| (5) Other | 18 | 32 | 12 | 31 | 52 | 27 | 82 | 29 |
| Total | 57 | 101* | 39 | 100 | 191 | 101* | 287 | 101* |

*Rounding error

TABLE 23

Rating of the Education Placement Office

| Subgroup: Teaching | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (1) Did not use services | 13 | 23 | 10 | 26 | 55 | 29 | 78 | 27 |
| (2) Unsatisfactory | 3 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 13 | 7 | 17 | 6 |
| (3) Fair | 17 | 30 | 8 | 21 | 31 | 16 | 56 | 20 |
| (4) Good | 17 | 30 | 14 | 36 | 56 | 29 | 87 | 30 |
| (5) Excellent | 7 | 12 | 6 | 15 | 36 | 19 | 49 | 17 |
| Total | 57 | 100 | 39 | 101* | 191 | 100 | 287 | 100 |

*Rounding error

TABLE 24
Location of Current Position

| Subgroup: Teaching | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (1) Urban | 18 | 33.3 | 11 | 29 | 41 | 21 | 70 | 25 |
| (2) Suburban | 18 | 33.3 | 13 | 34 | 68 | 35 | 99 | 35 |
| (3) Rural | 18 | 33.3 | 14 | 37 | 84 | 44 | 116 | 41 |
| Total | 54 | 100 | 38 | 100 | 193 | 100 | 285 | 101* |

*Rounding error

TABLE 25
Level of Teaching

| Subgroup: Teaching | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (1) Elementary | 14 | 25 | 15 | 39 | 48 | 25 | 77 | 27 |
| (2) Junior High | 10 | 18 | 3 | 8 | 40 | 21 | 53 | 18 |
| (3) Senior High | 33 | 58 | 21 | 54 | 103 | 54 | 157 | 55 |
| Total | 57 | 101* | 39 | 101* | 191 | 100 | 287 | 100 |

*Rounding error

TABLE 26
Size of Present School

| Subgroup: Teaching | 1978-1979 N | 1978-1979 % | 1980-1981 N | 1980-1981 % | 1981-1982 N | 1981-1982 % | Total N | Total % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (1) Under 500 | 28 | 50 | 22 | 56 | 103 | 54 | 153 | 54 |
| (2) 500 -- 1,000 | 18 | 32 | 12 | 31 | 56 | 29 | 86 | 30 |
| (3) Over 1,000 | 10 | 18 | 5 | 13 | 31 | 16 | 46 | 16 |
| Total | 56 | 100 | 39 | 100 | 190 | 99* | 285 | 100 |

*Rounding error

TABLE 27
Racial Mix of School

| Subgroup: Teaching | 1978-1979 N | 1978-1979 % | 1980-1981 N | 1980-1981 % | 1981-1982 N | 1981-1982 % | Total N | Total % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (1) Less than 5% Minority | 34 | 65 | 31 | 80 | 144 | 75 | 209 | 74 |
| (2) 5 -- 25% Minority | 9 | 17 | 6 | 15 | 23 | 12 | 38 | 13 |
| (3) 25 -- 50% Minority | 5 | 10 | 0 | -- | 12 | 6 | 17 | 6 |
| (4) More than 50% Minority | 4 | 8 | 2 | 5 | 13 | 7 | 19 | 7 |
| Total | 52 | 100 | 39 | 100 | 192 | 100 | 283 | 100 |

TABLE 28
Motivation of Present Students

| Subgroup: Teaching | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (3) High | 9 | 16 | 13 | 33 | 42 | 22 | 64 | 22 |
| (2) Average | 36 | 66 | 23 | 59 | 101 | 52 | 160 | 56 |
| (1) Low | 10 | 18 | 3 | 8 | 50 | 26 | 63 | 22 |
| Total | 55 | 100 | 39 | 100 | 193 | 100 | 287 | 100 |

TABLE 29
Present Classroom Discipline

| Subgroup: Teaching | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (1) No Problems | 13 | 24 | 12 | 31 | 41 | 21 | 66 | 23 |
| (2) Occasional Problems | 39 | 71 | 25 | 64 | 136 | 71 | 200 | 70 |
| (3) Many Problems | 3 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 15 | 8 | 20 | 7 |
| Total | 55 | 101* | 39 | 100 | 192 | 100 | 286 | 100 |

*Rounding error

TABLE 30
Satisfaction With Current Employment

| Subgroup: Teaching | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (5) Very Satisfied | 26 | 46 | 20 | 51 | 97 | 51 | 143 | 50 |
| (4) Somewhat Satisfied | 24 | 42 | 14 | 36 | 65 | 34 | 103 | 36 |
| (3) Neutral | 3 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 5 | 14 | 5 |
| (2) Somewhat Dissatisfied | 3 | 5 | 4 | 10 | 13 | 7 | 20 | 7 |
| (1) Very Dissatisfied | 1 | 2 | 0 | -- | 7 | 4 | 8 | 3 |
| Total | 57 | 100 | 39 | 100 | 192 | 101* | 288 | 101 |

*Rounding error

TABLE 31
Feelings About Teaching

| Subgroup: Teaching | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (5) Very Positive | 12 | 24 | 14 | 39 | 72 | 43 | 98 | 39 |
| (4) Positive | 28 | 56 | 17 | 47 | 66 | 39 | 111 | 44 |
| (3) Neutral | 7 | 14 | 4 | 11 | 22 | 13 | 33 | 13 |
| (2) Negative | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 9 | 4 |
| (1) Very Negative | 1 | 2 | 0 | -- | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| Total | 50 | 100 | 36 | 100 | 168 | 100 | 254 | 101* |

*Rounding error

TABLE 32
Usefulness of Educational Preparation

| Subgroup: Teaching | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (3) Very Useful | 35 | 61 | 26 | 67 | 103 | 53 | 164 | 57 |
| (2) Somewhat Useful | 21 | 37 | 13 | 33 | 87 | 45 | 121 | 42 |
| (1) Not Useful | 1 | 2 | 0 | -- | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 |
| Total | 57 | 100 | 39 | 100 | 193 | 100 | 289 | 100 |

TABLE 33

How Well Prepared to Teach

| Subgroup: Teaching | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (5) Was well prepared for all the responsibilities of teaching | 7 | 12 | 10 | 26 | 39 | 20 | 56 | 19 |
| (4) Was well prepared for the majority of the responsibilities of teaching | 26 | 46 | 17 | 44 | 93 | 48 | 136 | 47 |
| (3) Was generally prepared for the majority of the responsibilities of teaching | 22 | 39 | 11 | 28 | 55 | 29 | 88 | 31 |
| (2) Was unprepared for the majority of the responsibilities of teaching | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 3 |
| (1) Was unprepared for any of the responsibilities of teaching | 0 | -- | 0 | -- | 0 | -- | 0 | -- |
| Total | 57 | 101* | 39 | 101* | 192 | 100 | 288 | 100 |

*Rounding error

TABLE 34
Level of Confidence

| Subgroup: Teaching | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (4) Extremely Confident | 41 | 73 | 25 | 64 | 93 | 48 | 159 | 55 |
| (3) Somewhat Confident | 14 | 25 | 13 | 33 | 91 | 47 | 118 | 41 |
| (2) Somewhat Lacking in Confidence | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 9 | 3 |
| (1) Extremely Lacking in Confidence | 0 | -- | 0 | -- | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Total | 56 | 100 | 39 | 100 | 192 | 100 | 287 | 99* |

*Rounding error

TABLE 35
Teaching Effectiveness

| Subgroup: Teaching | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (4) Very Effective | 28 | 49 | 19 | 49 | 83 | 43 | 130 | 45 |
| 3) Moderately Effective | 29 | 51 | 19 | 49 | 107 | 55 | 155 | 54 |
| (2) Somewhat Ineffective | 0 | -- | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 |
| (1) Ineffective | 0 | -- | 0 | -- | 0 | -- | 0 | -- |
| Total | 57 | 100 | 39 | 101* | 193 | 100 | 289 | 100 |

*Rounding error

TABLE 36

Ways To Improve Effectiveness

| Subgroup: Teaching | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (1) Fewer or Smaller Classes | 18 | 33 | 10 | 27 | 56 | 30 | 84 | 30 |
| (2) Better Professional Preparation | 8 | 15 | 5 | 14 | 28 | 15 | 41 | 15 |
| (3) More Support From Other School Personnel | 10 | 18 | 46 | 14 | 24 | 13 | 39 | 14 |
| (4) More Lesson Preparation Time | 10 | 18 | 9 | 24 | 50 | 27 | 69 | 25 |
| (5) Other | 9 | 16 | 8 | 22 | 30 | 16 | 47 | 17 |
| Total | 55 | 100 | 37 | 101* | 188 | 101* | 280 | 101* |

*Rounding error

TABLE 37

Assistance With Discipline

| Subgroup: Teaching | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (7) Assistance Available and Effective | 31 | 55 | 22 | 56 | 126 | 67 | 179 | 63 |
| (6) Assistance Available but Ineffective | 8 | 14 | 5 | 13 | 27 | 14 | 40 | 14 |
| (5) Assistance Available in Extreme Circumstances | 6 | 11 | 6 | 15 | 15 | 8 | 27 | 10 |
| (4) No Assistance Available | 2 | 4 | 0 | -- | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| (3) Assistance Available but a Sign of Weakness | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 10 | 4 |
| (2) No Assistance Needed | 6 | 11 | 4 | 10 | 11 | 6 | 21 | 7 |
| (1) Other | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| Total | 56 | 101* | 39 | 100 | 189 | 101* | 284 | 100 |

*Rounding error

TABLE 38
Expectations for Supervising Extracurricular Activities

| Subgroup: Teaching | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (1) Voluntary | 41 | 73 | 21 | 55 | 119 | 66 | 181 | 66 |
| (2) Expected | 14 | 25 | 13 | 34 | 35 | 20 | 62 | 23 |
| (3) Required | 1 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 4 | 12 | 4 |
| (4) Condition of Employment | 0 | -- | 1 | 3 | 17 | 9 | 18 | 7 |
| Total | 56 | 100 | 38 | 100 | 179 | 99* | 273 | 100 |

*Rounding error

TABLE 39
Extracurricular Activities

| Subgroup: Teaching | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (1) Yes | 31 | 54 | 23 | 59 | 101 | 54 | 155 | 55 |
| (2) No | 26 | 46 | 16 | 41 | 86 | 46 | 128 | 45 |
| Total | 57 | 100 | 39 | 100 | 187 | 100 | 283 | 100 |

TABLE 40

Pay for Supervising Extracurricular Activities

| Subgroup: Teaching | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (1) Yes | 17 | 52 | 15 | 75 | 56 | 58 | 88 | 59 |
| (2) No | 16 | 49 | 5 | 25 | 40 | 42 | 61 | 41 |
| Total | 33 | 101* | 20 | 100 | 96 | 100 | 149 | 100 |

*Rounding error

TABLE 41

Who Evaluates Teaching

| Subgroup: Teaching | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (1) Teaching Colleagues | 1 | 2 | 0 | -- | 10 | 5 | 11 | 4 |
| (2) Department Head | 3 | 5 | 5 | 13 | 10 | 5 | 18 | 6 |
| (3) Students | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| (4) Curriculum Specialist | 0 | -- | 0 | -- | 9 | 5 | 9 | 3 |
| (5) Principal/Administrator | 51 | 91 | 33 | 85 | 150 | 81 | 234 | 83 |
| (6) Other | 0 | -- | 0 | -- | 5 | 3 | 5 | 2 |
| Total | 56 | 100 | 39 | 101* | 186 | 100 | 281 | 99* |

*Rounding error

TABLE 42

How Many Times Evaluated

| Subgroup: Teaching | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (1) 0 Times | 10 | 18 | 4 | 11 | 19 | 10 | 33 | 12 |
| (2) 1 Time | 16 | 29 | 7 | 18 | 21 | 12 | 44 | 16 |
| (3) 2-3 Times | 23 | 41 | 19 | 50 | 104 | 57 | 146 | 53 |
| (4) 4-6 Times | 3 | 5 | 4 | 11 | 25 | 14 | 32 | 12 |
| (5) More than 6 Times | 4 | 7 | 4 | 11 | 14 | 8 | 22 | 8 |
| Total | 56 | 100 | 38 | 101* | 183 | 99* | 277 | 101* |

*Rounding error

TABLE 43

Most Meaningful Evaluation Method

| Subgroup: Teaching | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (1) Students' Test Scores | 5 | 9 | 3 | 8 | 16 | 9 | 24 | 9 |
| (2) Colleagues' Feedback | 4 | 8 | 4 | 11 | 16 | 9 | 24 | 9 |
| (3) Students' Feedback | 13 | 25 | 9 | 24 | 31 | 17 | 53 | 20 |
| (4) Student Improvement | 21 | 40 | 15 | 41 | 80 | 44 | 116 | 43 |
| (5) Formal Evaluation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 11 | 6 | 15 | 6 |
| (6) Self-Evaluation | 6 | 11 | 2 | 5 | 22 | 12 | 30 | 11 |
| (7) Other | 3 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 3 |
| Total | 53 | 101* | 37 | 100 | 180 | 99* | 270 | 101* |

*Rounding error

TABLE 44

Person Helpful In Professional Development

| Subgroup: Teaching | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (1) Administrator | 10 | 19 | 7 | 19 | 48 | 27 | 65 | 25 |
| (2) Teaching Colleague | 30 | 58 | 20 | 54 | 90 | 51 | 140 | 53 |
| (3) Department Head/Curriculum Specialist | 4 | 8 | 7 | 19 | 9 | 5 | 20 | 8 |
| (4) Counselor | 0 | -- | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| (5) Other | 8 | 15 | 2 | 5 | 26 | 15 | 36 | 14 |
| Total | 52 | 100 | 37 | 100 | 176 | 100 | 265 | 102* |

*Rounding error

TABLE 45

Person Supportive and Encouraging

| Subgroup: Teaching | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (1) Administrator | 6 | 11 | 8 | 22 | 48 | 27 | 62 | 23 |
| (2) Counselor | 0 | -- | 0 | -- | 5 | 3 | 5 | 2 |
| (3) Fellow Teacher | 35 | 66 | 15 | 41 | 71 | 40 | 121 | 45 |
| (4) Relative or Friend | 9 | 17 | 11 | 30 | 42 | 24 | 62 | 23 |
| (5) No One Available | 1 | 2 | 0 | -- | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 |
| (6) Other | 2 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 13 | 5 |
| Total | 53 | 100 | 37 | 101* | 177 | 101* | 267 | 99* |

*Rounding error

TABLE 46
Teaching Perspective on Students

| Subgroup: Teaching | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (1) Strongly agree with A | 9 | 16 | 5 | 13 | 35 | 19 | 49 | 17 |
| (2) Emphasis on A with some elements of B | 35 | 64 | 20 | 51 | 104 | 55 | 159 | 56 |
| (3) Emphasis on B with some elements of A | 10 | 18 | 11 | 28 | 44 | 23 | 65 | 23 |
| (4) Strongly agree with B | 1 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 10 | 4 |
| Total | 55 | 100 | 39 | 100 | 189 | 100 | 283 | 100 |

TABLE 47
Teaching Perspective on Methods

| Subgroup: Teaching | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (1) Strongly agree with A | 4 | 7 | 2 | 5 | 23 | 12 | 29 | 10 |
| (2) Emphasis on A with some elements of B | 32 | 59 | 16 | 41 | 96 | 51 | 144 | 51 |
| (3) Emphasis on B with some elements of A | 16 | 30 | 17 | 44 | 58 | 31 | 91 | 32 |
| (4) Strongly agree with B | 2 | 4 | 4 | 10 | 13 | 7 | 19 | 7 |
| Total | 54 | 100 | 39 | 100 | 190 | 101* | 283 | 100 |

*Rounding error

TABLE 48

Teaching Perspective on Learning Outcomes

| Subgroup: Teaching | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (1) Strongly agree with A | 0 | -- | 0 | -- | 7 | 4 | 7 | 2 |
| (2) Emphsis on A with some elements of B | 12 | 22 | 18 | 46 | 40 | 21 | 70 | 25 |
| (3) Emphasis on B with sume elements of A | 36 | 66 | 12 | 31 | 103 | 55 | 151 | 54 |
| (4) Strongly agree with B | 7 | 13 | 9 | 23 | 38 | 20 | 54 | 19 |
| Total | 55 | 101* | 39 | 100 | 188 | 100 | 282 | 100 |

*Rounding error

TABLE 49

Full-Time/Part-Time Employment

| Subgroup: Education related | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (2) Full-time | 20 | 83 | 13 | 52 | 63 | 34 | 96 | 41 |
| (1) Part-time | 4 | 17 | 12 | 48 | 123 | 66 | 139 | 59 |
| Total | 24 | 100 | 25 | 100 | 186 | 100 | 235 | 100 |

## EDUCATION RELATED EMPLOYMENT

The individuals that comprise the education related employment subgroup are currently working in the education field but are not teaching. These individuals identified their present job as other school employment, i.e. counseling, administrating, curriculum design, etc; employment in post-secondary education; day-to-day substitution or other education related employment. They represent approximately 18 percent (N = 24) of the 1978-1979 sample; 22 percent (N = 25) of the 1980-1981 sample; and 31 percent (N = 189) of the 1981-1982 sample.

### 1978-1979 Sample

The 1978-1979 graduates who were in this category tended to be employed full time (83%) and found their educational preparation somewhat (42%) or very useful (50%) in their current positions. The majority had sought a teaching position (64%) and 33 percent regret that they are not teaching. Fifty-eight percent are very satisfied with their current employment and 29 percent somewhat satisfied. The three primary reasons this group is not teaching are: (1) salaries are too low; (2) chose to change professions; and (3) no jobs available. In this group, as with the noneducational employees, a large percentage (42%) did not use the services of the placement office. The next highest rating from this group was a good (21%). (See Tables 49 through 55).

The further analysis of this subgroup by the variables (a) program area and (b) sex produced no significant differences on the seven items examined.

### 1980-1981 Sample

The 1980-1981 sample gave responses similar to the 1978-1979 sample responses on the same seven items with the exception of reasons for not teaching. The majority of the respondents (52%) are employed full-time, and 100 percent found their educational preparation somewhat or very useful in their current employment. Sixty percent sought a teaching position and 67 percent regret they are not teaching. Yet 67 percent are somewhat or very satisfied with their current employment. The top three reasons they are not teaching were (1) no jobs available; (2) chose to change professions; and (3) not willing or unable to relocate. The ratings of the educational placement office were in the same general order as the 1978-1979 sample. Forty percent of the respondents to this item did not use the services and the next largest rating was good (32%). (See Tables 49 through 55).

The analyses of variance computed to ascertain any significant differences among program areas identified one variable that had a significant difference. On the variable whether or not an individual sought a teaching position, there was an overall difference but not between any two program areas (Appendix 2.1E). Analyses to ascertain differences between male and female respondents produced two items that had a significant difference. First, significantly more women than men sought teaching positions (Appendix 2.2E). In addition, more women regret not teaching than men (Appendix 2.3E).

1981-1982 Sample

The 1981-1982 sample had 189 respondents in its educational related employment subgroup. Sixty-six percent of the subgroup are employed full-time, and 95 percent find their educational preparation somewhat or very useful on their present jobs. Eighty-three percent of the respondents sought a teaching position, and a much smaller percentage (57%) than the previous years are somewhat or very satisfied with their current employment. A larger percentage (71%) also regret that they are not teaching. The top four reasons these individuals are not teaching are (1) no jobs available (56%); (2) not willing or unable to relocate (13%); (3) chose to change professions (5%); and (4) family responsibilities (5%). In rating the placement office the largest percentage (38%), smaller than the previous years, did not use the services. The next largest percentage rated the services as fair (21%); good was very close with 20 percent. (See Tables 49 through 55.)

The analyses of variance to ascertain differences within this subgroup produced four differences by program area and one by sex. On program area the four items that had significant overall differences were full-time or part-time employment (Appendix 3.1E); whether or not a teaching position was sought (Appendix 3.2E); regret about not teaching (Appendix 3.3E); and rating of the placement office (Appendix 3.4E). The variable that dealt with whether or not a teaching position was sought was the only variable that produced a significant difference between two specific program areas. The response value for this item was 1 for a response of yes and 2 for a response of no. The two program areas are elementary education and recreation education. Significantly more elementary education majors with a mean response of 1.0 sought a teaching position than the recreation majors with a mean response of 2.0 (Appendix 3.2E). The variable dealing with full-time or part-time employment was significantly different between females and males. Males tended to be employed full time (mean = 1.51), whereas females tended to be part-time (mean = 1.29) (Appendix 3.5E).

## Comparisons Across Sample Years

Further statistical analyses of the education related employment group using analysis of variance were performed to ascertain differences among sample years. One-way analyses of variances of the seven items examined for this subgroup produced differences on two questionnaire items. The two items were full-time or part-time employment and level of satisfaction with current employment. The differences demonstrate that significantly more 1978-1979 graduates employed in an educational related job are working in a full-time capacity than 1981-1982 graduates (Appendix 4.1E). In addition, the level of satisfaction with current employment is significantly greater for those graduates in the 1978-1979 sample than those in either or the other two sample years (Appendix 4.2E). There was no significant difference between the two most recent samples. These findings indicate very little difference among the education related subgroup between the sample years; therefore, the data can be combined and produce meaningful analyses and discussion.

TABLE 50

Usefulness of Educational Preparation

| Subgroup: Education related | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (3) Very useful | 12 | 50 | 11 | 46 | 92 | 49 | 115 | 49 |
| (2) Somewhat useful | 10 | 48 | 13 | 54 | 86 | 46 | 109 | 46 |
| (1) Not useful | 2 | 8 | 0 | -- | 9 | 5 | 11 | 5 |
| Total | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 187 | 100 | 235 | 100 |

TABLE 51

Sought a Teaching Position

| Subgroup: Education related | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (1) Yes | 7 | 64 | 9 | 60 | 85 | 83 | 101 | 79 |
| (2) No | 4 | 36 | 6 | 40 | 17 | 17 | 27 | 21 |
| Total | 11 | 100 | 15 | 100 | 102 | 100 | 128 | 100 |

TABLE 52
Regret They Are Not Teaching

| Subgroup: Education related | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (1) Yes | 3 | 33 | 10 | 67 | 66 | 71 | 79 | 68 |
| (2) No | 6 | 67 | 5 | 33 | 27 | 29 | 38 | 32 |
| Total | 9 | 100 | 15 | 100 | 93 | 100 | 117 | 100 |

TABLE 53
Satisfaction With Current Employment

| Subgroup: Education related | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (5) Very satisfied | 14 | 58 | 3 | 13 | 39 | 21 | 56 | 24 |
| (4) Somewhat satisfied | 7 | 29 | 13 | 54 | 68 | 36 | 88 | 37 |
| (3) Neutral | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 23 | 12 | 25 | 11 |
| (2) Somewhat dissatisfied | 1 | 4 | 5 | 21 | 39 | 21 | 45 | 19 |
| (1) Very dissatisfied | 1 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 20 | 11 | 23 | 10 |
| Total | 24 | 99* | 24 | 100 | 189 | 101* | 237 | 101* |

*Rounding error

TABLE 54

Reasons For Not Teaching

| Subgroup: Education related | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (1) Chose to change professions | 3 | 21 | 3 | 14 | 7 | 5 | 13 | 8 |
| (2) No jobs available | 2 | 14 | 9 | 43 | 77 | 56 | 88 | 51 |
| (3) Salaries are too low | 4 | 29 | 2 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 11 | 6 |
| (4) Not willing or unable to relocate | 0 | -- | 3 | 14 | 18 | 13 | 21 | 12 |
| (5) Family responsibilities | 1 | 7 | 0 | -- | 7 | 5 | 8 | 5 |
| (6) Academic record | 0 | -- | 0 | -- | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| (7) Quality of my teacher education program | 0 | -- | 0 | -- | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| (8) Other | 4 | 29 | 4 | 19 | 22 | 16 | 30 | 17 |
| Total | 14** | 100 | 21 | 100 | 138 | 101* | 173 | 101* |

*Rounding error
**Respondents could select more than one

TABLE 55

Rating of the Education Placement Office

| Subgroup: Education related | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (5) Excellent | 3 | 13 | 0 | -- | 13 | 7 | 16 | 7 |
| (4) Good | 5 | 21 | 8 | 32 | 37 | 20 | 50 | 21 |
| (3) Fair | 4 | 17 | 3 | 12 | 39 | 21 | 46 | 20 |
| (2) Unsatisfactory | 2 | 8 | 4 | 16 | 26 | 14 | 32 | 14 |
| (1) Did not use services | 10 | 42 | 10 | 40 | 71 | 38 | 91 | 39 |
| Total | 24 | 101* | 25 | 100 | 186 | 100 | 235 | 101* |

*Rounding error

## NONEDUCATION-RELATED EMPLOYMENT

The individuals in the noneducation-related subgroup are employed, but not in teaching or any other educational field. Some examples of the current positions in which these individuals are employed include waitress, waiter, retail buyer, fund raiser, teller, dental hygienist, research associate, customer service representative, insurance analyst, tour guide and a pediatric activity coordinator. It is evident from this list that the individuals in the noneducation-related subgroup are employed in a variety of areas. The percentage of graduates that fall into this category are 33 percent (N = 24), 38 percent (N = 25) and 32 percent (N = 189) for each respective sample year. There is no significant increase or decrease in the size of this group among the three years. Therefore, it can be concluded that approximately one-third of College of Education graduates are employed in a noneducation-related field.

In analyzing the responses of this group seven questionnaire items were examined. The seven items are item 6, full-time or part-time employment; item 7, level of satisfaction with current employment; item 8, usefulness of educational preparation in current job; item 9, rating of educational placement office; item 26, sought a teaching position; item 28, reasons for not teaching; and item 29, regret not teaching. (Tables 56 - 62).

### 1978 - 1979 Sample

In the 1978 - 1979 sample the majority (87%) of the noneducational employees were employed full-time. Twenty-six percent found their educational preparation very useful in their employment, and fifty-nine percent found it somewhat useful in their present position. Sixty-five percent of those that responded did seek employment as a teacher. Yet it appears that they are generally happy in their current positions, because only twenty-seven percent regret that they are not teaching and seventy-two percent are somewhat or very satisfied with their current employment.

The reasons these individuals selected for not teaching are numerous. The three major ones include (1) no jobs available (26%); (2) chose to change professions (24%) and (3) salaries too low (24%). A final item dealt with rating the services of the educational placement office. For this subgroup forty-nine percent did not use the services; the next largest percentage (23%) gave it a rating of fair. (See Tables 56 - 62).

Further analysis of the noneducationally employed subgroup, using the analysis of variance technique, produced overall difference between program areas on the item dealing with whether or not a teaching position

was sought after graduation and on the rating of the placement office. (Appendices 1.1F and 1.2F) The range of program areas' average ratings for the item dealing with seeking a teaching position was from a mean of 1 to a mean of 2. For the placement office item, the range was from a mean of 1 to a mean of 4. Follow-up procedures to identify specific differences between any two program areas produced no significant differences; this is due to the unequal sample sizes of the program areas. Analysis by sex produced no differences between the responses of females and males.

1980 - 1981 Sample

The 1980-1981 sample of noneducational employees yielded similar results. Ninety percent were engaged in full-time employment, and eighty percent found their educational preparation to be somewhat or very useful in their jobs. A slightly smaller percentage (54%) than the 1979 sample actually sought a teaching position, and a larger percentage (54%) regret not teaching. In line with these findings, a smaller percentage (69%) are very or somewhat satisfied with their current employment. The most frequently stated reasons for not teaching are in the same rank order with no jobs available, first, chose to charge professions, second, and salaries are too low, third. The rating of the educational placement office for this subgroup demonstrated that fifty-six percent did not use the service and again the second highest rating was fair (21%). (See Tables 56 - 62).

Additional analyses produced an overall difference by program area on the average rating of the educational placement office. The average ratings of the placement office for the program areas ranged from a mean of 1.0 to a mean of 3.2. There were no differences found between any two program areas. Again this is due to the wholly unequal sample sizes, ranging from one to six, which results in no specific differences between two groups. (Appendix 2.1F). On the sex variable two significant differences were produced. On the usefulness of their educational preparation in their current employment, males rated it more useful with an average rating of 2.4 than females ( mean = 1.86). More females (mean = 1.36) than males (mean = 1.77) indicated that they sought a teaching position. (Appendices 2.2F and 2.3F).

1981 - 1982 Sample

The 1981 - 1982 sample was a much larger sample, hence, the number of respondents in the subgroup was greater than the previous two years (39 each). Yet, the percentage (32%), was comparable to the other years which had 33 percent and 38 percent.

The majority of the respondents (82%) were engaged in full-time employment and found their educational preparation to be somewhat or very useful (70%) in their current employment. Fifty-two percent did seek teaching positions, yet a smaller percentage than the previous two years (61%) were somewhat or very satisfied with their current employment. The top three reasons these individuals were not teaching were the same as the previous years: (1) no jobs available (31%); (2) chose to change professions (15%); and (3) salaries too low (15%). In addition, another category, not willing or unable to relocate (15%), tied with the last two reasons. A comparable percentage (47%) regret they are not teaching. The rating of the educational placement office demonstrated that 46 percent did not use the services, and a rating of fair was the next largest choice (20%). But in this sample year the rating of good was not substantially different from the rating of fair, with 17 percent selecting it. (See Tables 56 - 62).

Further analyses to identify differences between program areas produced an overall significant difference on level of satisfaction (Appendix 3.1F), usefulness of educational preparation in current employment, (Appendix 3.2F), whether or not a teaching position was sought, (Appendix 3.3F), regrets about not teaching (Appendix 3.4F), and ratings of the educational placement office (Appendix 3.5F). Only regrets about not teaching produced a significant difference between any two groups (Appendix 3.4F). The two groups were dental hygiene and social studies education. The values for the responses to this item were 1 for a yeas and 2 for a no. The dental hygiene majors with a mean response of 1.9, for the most part did not regret not teaching whereas the social studies mjaors with a mean response of 1.0 did regret not teaching. The fact that dental hygienists are also trained to practice their profession in a private dental practice probably accounts for their overwhelming lack of regret about not teaching. No significant differences were found by the variable sex.

## Comparisons Across Sample Years

In the preceding discussions some comparisons were made between the years on the items studied just by examining the tables. Further statistical analysis of each item using a one-way analysis of variance by year produced only one significant difference. The item dealing with whether or not a graduate regretted not teaching produced statistical differences between the 1978-1979 graduates and the 1980-1981 graduates and between the 1978-1979 and 1981-1982 graduates (Appendix 4.1F). It appears that the graduates in this subgroup that have been in the job market the longest do not regret not teaching as much as the more recent graduates. The same results were obtained when the total sample was analyzed on this variable. Therefore, it can be concluded that with the exception of their feelings about not teaching, the graduates employed in a noneducational field generally have not changed over the three years studied. Furthermore, their regrets about not teaching lessen the longer they have been out of college. Finally, like the teaching and education related subgroups, the noneducation related subgroup data can be combined for the three sample years for analysis and discussion purposes.

## COMPARISONS BY SUBGROUPS

The final analyses of the follow-up data, using the analysis of variance technique, were performed to ascertain differences by employment subgroups within each sample year and as a total sample. There were six items that had a significant difference when the total sample was used. Significantly more teachers (mean = 1.93) are employed full-time than individuals employed in the education related or the noneducation-related subgroups (means = 1.41; 1.84). In addition, significantly more individuals employed in a noneducational field are full-time than those in educational related employment (Appendix 1.1G). The level of satisfaction with their current employment is significantly higher for teachers (mean = 4.29) than either education related (mean = 3.46) or noneducational employees (mean = 3.69) (Appendix 1.2G). Teachers found their educational preparation significantly more useful (mean = 2.56) than those individuals in the noneducation-related subgroup (mean = 1.99); the education related group also found it more useful (mean = 2.44) than the noneducational group (Appendix 1.3G). There was no significant difference between the teachers and the education related group. Between the educational related group and the noneducational group more individuals in the educational related group (mean = 1.21; mean = 1.46) sought a teaching position (Appendix 1.4G), and they were more regretful (mean = 1.32) about not currently teaching than the noneducation group (mean = 1.55) (Appendix 1.5G). In the rating of the placement office the teachers rated its services significantly higher (mean = 3.05) than either the education related (mean = 2.44) or the noneducation related (mean = 2.22) subgroups (Appendix 1.6G).

### 1978-1979 Sample

There were only two items in this sample year that produced a significant difference in the responses of the employment subgroups. First, teachers rated the services of the educational placement office significantly higher (mean = 2.98) than the noneducation-related subgroup (mean = 2.13) (Appendix 2.1G). The second item that produced a significant difference between the employment subgroups dealt with the usefulness of their educational preparation on their current job. Teachers rated their preparation significantly more useful (mean = 2.61) than those individuals employed in the noneducation-related field. (Appendix 2.2G)

### 1980-1981 Sample

Four significant differences were produced in this sample year by employment subgroup. The results on the full-time or part-time item demonstrated that teachers are employed full-time significantly more (mean = 1.95) than the education related group (mean = 1.52); the noneducational

group (mean = 1.90) more than the education related group (Appendix 3.1G). The level of satisfaction with their current employment is significantly higher for teachers (mean = 4.35) than educational related employees (mean = 3.42), but not significantly higher than individuals in the noneducational field (mean = 3.77) (Appendix 3.2G). The usefulness of their educational preparation is higher for teachers (mean = 2.68) than noneducational related employees (mean = 2.00), and it is higher for the educational related (mean = 2.46) than the noneducational group, but there is no difference between teachers and educational related employees (Appendix 3.3G). These are the same results that were found in the total sample. Finally, the rating of the placement office services was only significantly different between the teachers (mean = 3.10) and the noneducational group (mean = 1.90) (Appendix 3.4G).

1981-1982 Sample

Six significant differences were found in this sample. These are the same six that were found in the total sample. On the full-time/part-time employment item teachers (mean = 1.92) and noneducation-related employees (mean = 1.82) rated themselves as primarily full-time employees. Both of these ratings were significantly different from the education related subgroup with a mean of 1.34 (Appendix 4.1G). The item satisfaction with current employment demonstrated that teachers (mean = 2.52) and education related employees (mean = 2.44) are significantly more satisfied than noneducation-related employees with a mean of 1.97 (Appendix 4.2G).

Between the educational related employees and the noneducation related employees, more of the former group (mean 1.17) sought a teaching position than the latter group (mean = 1.48) (Appendix 4.3G). In the education related subgroup significantly more (mean = 1.29) regret not teaching than the noneducation-related group (mean = 1.53) (Appendix 4.4G). Finally, the rating of the educational placement office's services were significantly higher for teachers (mean = 3.07) than either the education related subgroup (mean = 2.44) or the noneducation-related subgroup (mean = 2.30) (Appendix 4.5G).

TABLE 56
Full-Time/Part-Time Employment

| Subgroup: Noneducation-related | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (2) Full-time | 34 | 87 | 35 | 90 | 150 | 82 | 219 | 84 |
| (1) Part-time | 5 | 13 | 4 | 10 | 32 | 18 | 41 | 16 |
| Total | 39 | 100 | 39 | 100 | 182 | 100 | 260 | 100 |

TABLE 57
Usefulness of Educational Preparation

| Subgroup: Noneducation-related | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (3) Very useful | 10 | 26 | 8 | 21 | 49 | 27 | 67 | 26 |
| (2) Somewhat useful | 23 | 59 | 23 | 59 | 78 | 43 | 124 | 48 |
| (1) Not useful | 6 | 15 | 8 | 21 | 54 | 30 | 68 | 26 |
| Total | 39 | 100 | 39 | 101* | 181 | 100 | 259 | 100 |

*Rounding error

TABLE 58
Sought A Teaching Position

| Subgroup: Noneducation-related | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (1) Yes | 24 | 65 | 20 | 54 | 91 | 52.3 | 135 | 54 |
| (2) No | 13 | 35 | 17 | 46 | 83 | 47.7 | 113 | 46 |
| Total | 37 | 100 | 37 | 100 | 174 | 100 | 248 | 100 |

TABLE 59
Regret They Are Not Teaching

| Subgroup: Noneducation-related | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (1) Yes | 9 | 27 | 19 | 54 | 78 | 47 | 106 | 45 |
| (2) No | 24 | 73 | 16 | 46 | 88 | 53 | 128 | 55 |
| Total | 33 | 100 | 35 | 100 | 166 | 100 | 234 | 100 |

TABLE 60
Satisfaction With Current Employment

| Subgroup: Noneducation-related | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (5) Very satisfied | 17 | 44 | 14 | 36 | 59 | 33 | 90 | 35 |
| (4) Somewhat satisfied | 11 | 28 | 13 | 33 | 50 | 28 | 74 | 29 |
| (3) Neutral | 6 | 15 | 4 | 10 | 28 | 16 | 38 | 15 |
| (2) Somewhat dissatisfied | 3 | 8 | 5 | 13 | 31 | 17 | 39 | 15 |
| (1) Very dissatisfied | 2 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 13 | 7 | 18 | 7 |
| Total | 39 | 100 | 39 | 100 | 181 | 101* | 259 | 101* |

*Rounding error

TABLE 61
Reasons For Not Teaching

| Subgroup: Noneducation-related | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (1) Chose to change professions | 14 | 24 | 16 | 28 | 46 | 15 | 76 | 18 |
| (2) No jobs available | 15 | 26 | 17 | 29 | 93 | 31 | 125 | 30 |
| (3) Salaries too low | 14 | 24 | 8 | 14 | 46 | 15 | 68 | 16 |
| (4) Not willing or unable to relocate | 7 | 12 | 5 | 9 | 45 | 15 | 57 | 14 |
| (5) Family responsibilities | 3 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 15 | 5 | 19 | 5 |
| (6) Academic record | 1 | 2 | 0 | -- | 0 | -- | 1 | 0 |
| (7) Quality of teacher education program | 1 | 2 | 0 | -- | 6 | 2 | 7 | 2 |
| (8) Other | 3 | 5 | 11 | 19 | 49 | 16 | 63 | 15 |
| Total | 58 | 100 | 58 | 101* | 300 | 99* | 416 | 100 |

*Rounding error

TABLE 62
Rating of Education Placement Office

| Subgroup: Noneducation-related | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (5) Excellent | 1 | 3 | 0 | -- | 13 | 7 | 14 | 5 |
| (4) Good | 6 | 15 | 5 | 13 | 31 | 17 | 42 | 16 |
| (3) Fair | 9 | 23 | 8 | 21 | 37 | 20 | 54 | 21 |
| (2) Unsatisfactory | 4 | 10 | 4 | 10 | 18 | 10 | 26 | 10 |
| (1) Did not use services | 19 | 49 | 22 | 56 | 83 | 46 | 124 | 48 |
| Total | 39 | 100 | 39 | 100 | 182 | 100 | 260 | 100 |

TABLE 63
Location of Student Teaching

| Subgroup: All | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (1) Urban | 42 | 33 | 29 | 27 | 187 | 32 | 258 | 32 |
| (2) Suburban | 73 | 58 | 67 | 62 | 312 | 54 | 452 | 56 |
| (3) Rural | 12 | 9 | 12 | 11 | 80 | 14 | 104 | 13 |
| Total | 127 | 100 | 108 | 100 | 579 | 100 | 814 | 101* |

*Rounding error

## STUDENT TEACHING

The following discussion is based on the five questionnaire items (18, 19, 20, 21 and 22) that dealt with the individuals student teaching experience. The descriptive statistics used for this section were computed on each total sample year. (See Tables 63 to 67)

### 1978-1979 Sample

The majority (58%) of the graduates had their student teaching experience in a suburban setting. Thirty-three percent of students taught in an urban school. The large majority of the graduates did not have many classroom discipline problems. Fifty-eight percent stated they had occasional problems and 32 percent stated they had no problems. The students encountered during the student teaching experience were rated by the majority (64%) of the graduates as at grade level in terms of academic ability. Twenty-three percent rated their students as below grade level, and 14 percent rated the students above grade level.

The relationship the respondents had with their cooperating teacher and the overall student teaching experience was rated high; eighty-six percent of the responents rated their relationship with their cooperating teacher as very good or good. Only four percent rated it as poor or very poor. In terms of the overall student teaching experience, 98 percent rated it as somewhat successful or successful.

### 1980-1981 Sample

This sample was similar to the 1978-1979 year in regard to the location of their student teaching experience. Sixty-four percent were in suburban schools, twenty-seven percent in urban schools and eleven percent in rural schools. The classroom discipline problems encountered were virtually the same. The largest percentage (59%) had occasional problems and a little over a third (35%) had no problems. The students in these classes were rated by the majority of respondents (60%) at grade level. Twenty-seven percent rated their students above grade level.

An overwhelming majority (91%) of respondents rated their relationship with their cooperating teacher as very good or good. Seventy-eight percent rated their student teaching experience as successful and 21 percent as somewhat successful.

1981-1982 Sample

As student teachers these respondents primarily were placed in suburban locations (54%). Thirty-two percent were in urban schools and 14 percent in rural settings. This was the largest percentage in rural schools for the three sample years. Examination of table 63 indicates a slight increase in the rural school placements from year to year. As with the previous two samples the majority of the respondents (58%) stated they had occasional problems and almost one third stated they had no problems. In addition, the ability level of the student taught during their student teaching experience was rated at grade level by fifty-six percent of the respondents. Ability above grade level and below grade level were each selected by 22 percent of the respondents.

This sample also was generally pleased with their cooperating teacher and their overall student teaching experience. Eighty-seven percent rated their relationship with their cooperating teacher as very good or good. Furthermore, eighty-one percent rated their student teaching experience as successful with an additional 17 percent rating it as somewhat successful.

Comparison of Student Teaching Items by Year

The five items dealing with the graduates' student teaching experiences were subjected to a series of one-way analyses of variance to ascertain any differences among sample years. The results of these analyses produced a significant difference on only one questionnaire item. The item dealt with the graduates' rating of the ability level of the students during their student teaching experience. The 1980-1981 graduates rated their students' ability significantly higher (mean = 2.14) than the 1978-1979 graduates (mean = 1.90) (Appendix 1.1H).

Overall, the ratings of the student teaching experience, the placement of the students and the problems with classroom discipline have not changed during the three years. According to this data, it is safe to conclude that the student teaching experiences from 1978-1979 to 1981-1982 have been relatively consistent.

TABLE 64
Classroom Discipline During Student Teaching

| Subgroup: All | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (1) No problems | 41 | 32 | 38 | 35 | 187 | 32 | 266 | 33 |
| (2) Occasional problems | 73 | 58 | 64 | 59 | 339 | 58 | 476 | 58 |
| (3) Many problems | 13 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 54 | 9 | 73 | 9 |
| Total | 127 | 100 | 108 | 100 | 580 | 99* | 815 | 100 |
| Mean | 1.78 | | 1.70 | | 1.77 | | | |
| Standard Deviation | .62 | | .57 | | .60 | | | |

*Rounding error

TABLE 65
Success of Student Teaching Experience

| Subgroup: All | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (3) Successful | 96 | 76 | 85 | 78 | 468 | 81 | 649 | 80 |
| (2) Somewhat successful | 28 | 22 | 23 | 21 | 97 | 17 | 148 | 18 |
| (1) Unsuccessful | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 15 | 3 | 18 | 2 |
| Total | 126 | 100 | 109 | 100 | 580 | 101* | 815 | 100 |
| Mean | 2.74 | | 2.77 | | 2.78 | | | |
| Standard Deviation | .47 | | .44 | | .47 | | | |

*Rounding error

TABLE 66

Relationship With Cooperating Teacher

| Subgroup: All | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (5) Very good | 77 | 61 | 82 | 75 | 406 | 70 | 565 | 70 |
| (4) Good | 31 | 25 | 17 | 16 | 96 | 17 | 144 | 18 |
| (3) Fair | 13 | 10 | 8 | 7 | 53 | 9 | 74 | 9 |
| (2) Poor | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 15 | 3 | 19 | 2 |
| (1) Very poor | 3 | 2 | 0 | -- | 8 | 1 | 11 | 1 |
| Total | 126 | 100 | 109 | 100 | 578 | 100 | 813 | 100 |
| Mean | 4.41 | | 4.64 | | 4.52 | | | |
| Standard Deviation | .91 | | .70 | | .87 | | | |

TABLE 67

Ability Level of Students During Student Teaching

| Subgroup: All | 1978-1979 | | 1980-1981 | | 1981-1982 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| (3) Above grade level | 17 | 14 | 29 | 27 | 126 | 22 | 172 | 21 |
| (2) At grade level | 80 | 64 | 64 | 60 | 325 | 56 | 469 | 58 |
| (1) Below grade level | 29 | 23 | 14 | 13 | 128 | 22 | 171 | 21 |
| Total | 126 | 101* | 107 | 100 | 579 | 100 | 812 | 100 |
| Mean | 1.91 | | 2.14 | | 1.99 | | | |
| Standard Deviation | .60 | | .62 | | .66 | | | |

*Rounding error

## IDENTIFIED CURRICULUM AREAS FOR INCREASED EMPHASIS

Although 77 percent of the graduates who are teaching rated themselves as well prepared or generally prepared for the majority of the responsibilities of teaching, and an additional 19 percent rated themselves as well prepared for all the responsibilities of teaching, they identified areas of the teacher education program in which they feel they need additional or better preparation. Tables 68, 69, and 70 contain a list of areas identified by the teachers for each sample year. As expected, dealing with discipline is the most frequently identified area for the sample years 1980-1981 and 1981-1982. The most frequently identified area for the 1978-1979 sample year was increased practical experience. This category included comments regarding the everyday activities and problems associated with teaching and individualizing instruction. Discipline was the second most frequently identified area for this sample year.

For the 1980-1981 sample year, the second and third highest areas of concern were communication skills in dealing with parents, administrators, and the community and more practical experience, respectively. The teachers in the 1981-1982 sample year identified content area preparation and lesson/curriculum planning and student evaluation, respectively, as their second and third areas for additional work.

These findings do not indicate any one overwhelming area of concern for all three sample years. Yet, discipline appeared in all three sample years in the top three ranked areas; the same is true for an increase in practical experience regarding individualizing instruction and the everyday activities and problems of teaching. Furthermore, an examination of Tables 68-70 indicates the range of areas identified by the teachers. An analysis of these responses by program area has been provided to each respecitve program. This should prove valuable to the individual program areas because many of the responses were specific to the teachers' majors.

TABLE 68

Identified Curriculum Areas for Increased Emphasis

1978-1979

| | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Teacher-Parent, Administrator, Teacher, Public Relations | 5 | 9 |
| Discipline | 9 | 16 |
| Content Area Preparation | 4 | 7 |
| Lesson Planning and Evaluation of Students | 5 | 9 |
| Organization and Time Management | 2 | 4 |
| Administrative and Extra-Curricular Duties | 3 | 5 |
| More Practical Experience | 14 | 25 |
| Using Media and Outside Resources | 4 | 7 |
| Legal Rights and Responsibilities | 3 | 5 |
| Motivating Students | 2 | 4 |
| Teaching Adults | 1 | 2 |
| Effective Methods and Implementation | 2 | 4 |
| Professionalism | 1 | 2 |
| Total | 55 | 99%* |

*Rounding error

TABLE 69

Identified Curriculum Areas for Increased Emphasis

1980-1981

| | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Substitute Teaching | 1 | 2 |
| Teacher-Parent, Administrator, Teacher, Public Relations | 8 | 16 |
| Discipline | 14 | 29 |
| Content Area Planning | 5 | 10 |
| Lesson Planning and Evaluation of Students | 4 | 8 |
| Organization and Time Management | 4 | 8 |
| Administrative and Extra-Curricular Duties | 4 | 8 |
| More Practical Experience | 7 | 14 |
| Using Media and Outside Resources | 2 | 4 |
| Total | 49 | 99%* |

*Rounding error

TABLE 70

Identified Curriculum Areas for Increased Emphasis

1981-1982

| | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Teacher-Parent, Administrator, Teacher, Public Relations | 8 | 3 |
| Discipline | 75 | 32 |
| Content Area Preparation | 24 | 10 |
| Lesson/Curriculum Planning and Evaluation of Students | 19 | 8 |
| Organization and Time Management | 10 | 4 |
| Administrative and Extra-Curricular Duties | 8 | 3 |
| More Practical Experience | 6 | 3 |
| Using Media and Outside Resources | 3 | 1 |
| Legal Rights and Responsibilites | 4 | 2 |
| Motivating Students | 14 | 5 |
| Teaching Grades 6-8 | 6 | 3 |
| Effective Methods and Implementation | 10 | 4 |
| Computers | 3 | 1 |
| Teaching Handwriting Skills | 3 | 1 |
| More Training in Secondary Areas | 1 | 4 |
| Stress and Burn-Out | 2 | 1 |
| Individualization and Mainstreaming | 10 | 4 |
| Substitute Teaching | 7 | 3 |
| Standardized Testing | 6 | 3 |
| Reading Instruction | 8 | 3 |
| Professionalism | 1 | 4 |
| Effective Questioning | 1 | 4 |
| Total | 238 | 99%* |

*Rounding error

## SUMMARY

The 1983 Follow-Up Study was performed utilizing three sample years of graduates: 1978-1979; 1980-1981; and 1981-1982. Information was collected from a 20 percent random sample stratified by program area (academic major) for the 1978-1979 and 1980-1981 sample years and the total population for the 1981-1982 sample year.

The follow-up questionnaire mailed to the subjects yielded a large amount of information about the graduates surveyed from the three sample years. Both the 1980-1981 sample and the 1981-1982 sample proved to be representative of their populations on both program area and sex. The 1978-1979 sample was representative of its population on the sex variable but not on the program area variable. The nonrepresentativeness on the program area variable was due to the over sampling of small program areas in order to include enough subjects to produce stable statistical results for these program areas. The impact of this situation on the outcome of the study was found to be negligible and therefore the results present a valid profile of graduates of the college. Analyses indicated that there was very little difference among the sample years. In addition, the comparisons made between sex, among program areas (academic majors), employment subgroups and teaching produced some interesting and important findings. Briefly, some of those findings are:

1. The majority of the graduates (75%) are female; yet there has been a progressive increase in the number of male graduates from sample year to sample year.

2. Over 90 percent of the graduates are employed but approximately one third are in noneducation-related positions.

3. Although the graduates are generally satisfied with their current positions, those teaching are significantly more satisifed than those in education related or noneducation related employment.

4. The majority of the students (73%) felt that personal initiative was the most important strategy for securing employment.

5. Within the teaching employment subgroup, those individuals teaching the longest were more satisfied with their jobs than the more recent teachers.

6. The location of the graduates' current teaching positions can be grouped into the following community types:

| | |
|---|---|
| Urban | 25% |
| Suburban | 35% |
| Rural | 41% |

7. Fifty-five percent of the teachers are teaching at the senior high level; 27 percent are teaching at the elementary level and 18 percent at the junior high level.

8. Sixty-six percent of the teachers feel that supervision of extracurricular activities is voluntary and 55 percent of the teachers actually supervise extracurricular activities.

9. Generally, the graduates reported their student teaching experience to be quite successful. For example, 98 percent of the graduates rated their experience as somewhat successful or successful; 88 percent reported having a good or very good relationship with their cooperating teacher.

10. Seventy-five percent of the students completed all four years at The Ohio State University.

11. Approximately 50 percent expressed a desire to obtain an advanced degreee in education; another 25 percent plan to obtain one in a noneducation field.

Because the samples, primarily, were representative of their populations, these findings can be generalized with confidence to the target populations of College of Education graduates or specific program areas.

# APPENDICES

FOLLOW-UP DEMOGRAPHICS/SCHOOL CLIMATE
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS: IF YOU ARE NOT TEACHING FULL OR PART TIME, COMPLETE QUESTIONS 1-29.
IF YOU ARE A REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHER (FULL TIME, PART TIME, OR PERMANENT SUBSTITUTE) COMPLETE QUESTIONS 1-25 AND 30-55.

Circle the appropriate letter.

1. Age
   a. 20-25
   b. 26-30
   c. 31-35
   d. 36-40
   e. over 40

2. Sex
   a. female
   b. male

3. Racial-ethnic background
   a. Asian-American
   b. Black, non-Hispanic
   c. Hispanic
   d. Native American (American Indian)
   e. White
   f. Other (specify) _____

CURRENT EMPLOYMENT

4. Are you currently employed?
   a. yes
   b. no
   If yes, answer questions 5-9. If no, go to question 9.

5. Which of the following describes your current employment?
   a. regular classroom teaching (include art, music, reading, etc.)
   b. other school employment (counseling, administrating, curriculum design, media, etc.)
   c. employed in post secondary education
   d. permanent substitution
   e. day to day substitution
   f. other education related (specify) _____
   g. other non-education related (specify) _____
   What is your job title? _____

6. Is this position considered
   a. full time
   b. part time
   Specify average hours per week _____

7. Which one of the following best describes your level of satisfaction with your present position?
   a. very satisfied
   b. somewhat satisfied
   c. neutral
   d. somewhat dissatisfied
   e. very dissatisfied

8. Has your educational preparation been useful in your present position?
   a. very useful
   b. somewhat useful
   c. not useful

9. How would you rate the Educational Personnel Placement Office services?
   a. excellent
   b. good
   c. fair
   d. unsatisfactory
   e. did not use services

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

10. Were you a transfer student?
    a. No, I completed my entire undergraduate career at OSU.
    b. Yes, I entered OSU as a freshman.
    c. Yes, I entered OSU as a sophomore.
    d. Yes, I entered OSU as a junior.
    e. Yes, I entered OSU as a senior.
    f. Other (specify) _____

11. Quarter and year of graduation _____

12. Identify your undergraduate program area (major) from the list of program areas on the attached list and write the appropriate number in the space provided. _____

13. If you are considering further professional study, please circle the appropriate description below.
    a. professional study in education--Master's degree
    b. professional study in education--Doctorate degree
    c. professional study in education--Specialist degree
    d. professional study in field other than education (specify) _____
    e. not considering further professional study

14. If you have started graduate studies, how many credit hours have you completed? _____

Answer questions 15-17 if you have completed a graduate degree.

15. Circle the highest degree you have completed beyond the Bachelor's degree.
    a. Master's degree
    b. Ph.D.
    c. Specialist degree

16. In what field of study did you receive the degree circled in question 15? _____

17. At what institution did you complete the degree circled in question 15? _____

Circle the category that best describes your student teaching situation.

18. Location:
    a. urban
    b. suburban
    c. rural

19. Classroom discipline:
    a. no problems
    b. occasional problems
    c. many problems

20. Ability level of students:
    a. above grade level
    b. at grade level
    c. below grade level

21. Student teaching experience:
    a. successful
    b. somewhat successful
    c. unsuccessful

22. Relationship with cooperating teacher:
    a. very good
    b. good
    c. fair
    d. poor
    e. very poor

23. How many years of full time teaching experience, including this year, have you had?
    a. none
    b. one
    c. two
    d. three
    e. four or more

24. Which one of the following best describes your present feelings about teaching as a career?
    a. very positive
    b. positive
    c. neutral
    d. negative
    e. very negative

25. List your major reasons for entering a preservice teacher education program.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INDIVIDUALS NOT TEACHING

If you are not teaching complete questions 26-29, check the accuracy of your address and return the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope. Thank you for your assistance.

26. Have you ever sought a teaching position?
   1 a. yes
   2 b. no

27. If yes, which of the following did you utilize in seeking a teaching position? (Circle all that apply.)
   1 a. Educational Personnel Placement Office
   2 b. other placement services on campus
   3 c. letters written to prospective employers
   4 d. private or public employment agencies
   5 e. other (specify)

28. Why are you not teaching at the present time? (Circle all that apply.)
   1 a. chose to change professions
   2 b. no jobs available
   3 c. salaries are too low
   4 d. not willing or unable to relocate
   5 e. family responsibilities
   6 f. academic record
   7 g. quality of my teacher education program
   8 h. other (specify) _____

29. Do you regret that you are not teaching?
   1 a. yes
   2 b. no

You are finished with the questionnaire. Please check your answers for accuracy and return the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope.

INDIVIDUALS TEACHING FULL OR PART TIME

Complete questions 30-55 if you are a regular classroom teacher (full time, part time or permanent substitute).

30. Which one of the following best describes your current position in terms of your educational background?
   1 a. employed in major field
   2 b. employed in minor field
   3 c. employed in major and minor field
   4 d. employed in an educational field other than those prepared for at OSU (specify) _____

31. Please indicate which one of the following was most helpful to you in securing employment.
   1 a. College of Education faculty member
   2 b. department or program chairperson
   3 c. Educational Personnel Placement Office
   4 d. personal initiative
   5 e. other (specify) _____

32. How did you obtain your first teaching position?
   1 a. found a job in the district in which I student taught
   2 b. began as a substitute and was later hired as a regular teacher
   3 c. personal contact (friends, relatives)
   4 d. Placement Office or other university assistance
   5 e. other (specify) _____

Circle the category that best describes your current teaching situation.

33. Location:
   1 a. urban
   2 b. suburban
   3 c. rural

34. Typical student motivation:
   3 a. high
   2 b. average
   1 c. low

35. Classroom discipline:
   1 a. no problems
   2 b. occasional problems
   3 c. many problems

36. Racial mix:
   1 a. less than 5% minority students (Black, Hispanic, etc.)
   2 b. 5%-25% minority students
   3 c. 25%-50% minority students
   4 d. more than 50% minority students

37. School size:
   1 a. under 500
   2 b. 500-1000
   3 c. over 1000

38. Which grades or grade level do you spend the major part of your time teaching? _____

39. How would you rate your teaching?
   1 a. very effective
   2 b. moderately effective
   3 c. somewhat ineffective
   4 d. ineffective

40. Which one factor would be most helpful in improving your teaching effectiveness?
   1 a. fewer or smaller classes
   2 b. better professional preparation
   3 c. more support from other school personnel
   4 d. more lesson preparation time
   5 e. other (specify) _____

41. Overall, to what extent did your program in teacher education provide the knowledge and skills necessary for successful teaching in your area?
   5 a. I was well prepared to take on all the responsibilities of teaching.
   4 b. I was well prepared to take on the majority of the responsibilities of teaching.
   3 c. I was generally prepared to take on the majority of the responsibilities of teaching.
   2 d. I was unprepared to take on the majority of the responsibilities of teaching.
   1 e. I was unprepared to take on any of the responsibilities of teaching.

   If you chose b, c, d or e, identify those areas in which you would like additional and/or better preparation.

42. In general, how would you judge your level of confidence in carrying out the responsibilities of teaching this year?
   4 a. extremely confident
   3 b. somewhat confident
   2 c. somewhat lacking in confidence
   1 d. extremely lacking in confidence

43. Do we have your permission to contact your immediate supervisor to obtain general information?
   1 a. yes
   2 b. no

   If yes, please identify your supervisor by name and give the appropriate address.

   _____

   _____

   _____

PROFESSIONAL INTERACTIONS IN THE SCHOOL SETTING

44. Describe the assistance you receive with discipline problems.
   7 a. assistance available and effective
   6 b. assistance available, but ineffective
   5 c. assistance available only in extreme circumstances
   4 d. no assistance available
   3 e. assistance available, but request for assistance is viewed as a weakness on the part of the teacher
   2 f. no assistance needed
   1 g. other (specify) _____

45. Supervision of extracurricular activities is:
   1 a. completely voluntary on my part
   2 b. expected by the school administration
   3 c. required by the school administration
   4 d. a condition of my employment with the district

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)


BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROFESSIONAL INTERACTIONS IN THE SCHOOL SETTING (Continued)

46. Are you currently supervising extracurricular activities?
   a. yes
   b. no

47. If you answered "yes" to question 46, are you paid for this responsibility?
   a. yes
   b. no

48. Which one of the following had the primary responsibility for evaluating your teaching?
   a. teaching colleagues
   b. department head
   c. students
   d. curriculum specialist
   e. principal/administrator
   f. other (specify) _____

49. How many times this year has this person observed and evaluated your teaching?
   a. 0 times
   b. 1 time
   c. 2-3 times
   d. 4-5 times
   e. more than 5 times

50. Which one of the following methods is most meaningful to you in evaluating your teaching effectiveness?
   a. student test scores from standardized and teacher-made tests
   b. colleagues' feedback
   c. students' feedback
   d. student improvement
   e. formal performance evaluation
   f. self evaluation
   g. other (specify) _____

51. Which one of these people has been most helpful to your professional development?
   a. administrator
   b. teaching colleague
   c. department head or curriculum specialist
   d. counselor
   e. other (specify) _____

52. During your first year of teaching, which one of these people provided support and encouragement?
   a. administrator or instructional coordinator
   b. counselor
   c. a fellow teacher
   d. a relative or friend
   e. no one available
   f. other (specify) _____

TEACHING PERSPECTIVE

Using the continuum described below for items 53-55, circle the number which best denotes your general position in regard to the three teaching beliefs listed below which could serve to guide your decisions and actions in the classroom.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly agree with A | A represents my emphasis but my position includes some elements of Position B | B represents my emphasis but my position includes some elements of Position A | Strongly agree with B |

| | Position A | | Position B |
|---|---|---|---|
| 53. | Students are dependent on the teacher for direction; they work and learn best when they are required to complete specifically delineated learning assignments. | 1 2 3 4 | Students are independent of the teacher and are capable of being self-directed; they work and learn best when given the opportunity to set individual goals and learning activities. |
| 54. | Learning Outcomes The most important learning outcomes are the predetermined cognitive knowledge outcomes related to the particular subject(s) being taught. | 1 2 3 4 | The most important learning outcomes are the emerging affective and process outcomes developed through activities in and outside the classroom. |
| 55. | Methods Methods for carrying out instructions should be determined in advance and should provide specific directions for how each learning activity and assignment is to be performed. | 1 2 3 4 | Methods for carrying out instructions should provide opportunities for students to make decisions about and direct their own learning. |

PLEASE CHECK THE ACCURACY OF YOUR ADDRESS AND RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ENCLOSED ENVELOPE. THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE IN THIS EFFORT. WE ARE LOOKING FORWARD TO HEARING FROM YOU IN THE NEAR FUTURE.

---

This label will be detached before we analyze your responses. We attached your label only to avoid sending you another questionnaire. If your address has changed, please correct.

What is your phone number? (  ) _____

Rev. February 1983

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM AREAS
(Question 12)

1. Agriculture Education
2. Art Education
3. Biological Science Education
4. Broadcast Communications Education
5. Business Education
6. Dance Education
7. Dental Hygiene Education
8. Distributive Education (Voc-Tech)
9. Earth Science Education
10. Elementary Education
11. Elementary-Special Education
12. English Education
13. English Communications Education
14. Exceptional Children Education
15. Foreign Language Education
16. Health Education
17. Home Economics Education
18. Industrial Technology Education
19. Interscholastic Sports Education
20. Journalism Education
21. Mathematics Education
22. Media Education
23. Music Education
24. Physical Education
25. Physical Sciences Education
26. Recreation Education
27. Science Education
28. Social Studies Education
29. Speech-Theatre Education
30. Trade and Industrial Education

OSU

The Ohio State University

Office of the Dean
Follow-up Project

060-A Ramseyer Hall
29 West Woodruff Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210

March 14, 1983

Dear Graduate:

We need your assistance! It won't take long and it will help us plan for the future. The College of Education is attempting to collect information regarding the status of its graduates. The enclosed questionnaire contains questions that address your current job situation and your educational courses and experiences. Your response to the questionnaire will enable the college to ascertain how and what its former students are currently doing. In addition, this information will assist us in modifying our current programs to better prepare students for their professional careers.

We would appreciate you taking time from your busy schedule to complete the enclosed questionnaire before April 11, 1983. A postage paid return envelope has been provided for your convenience.

Your individual responses will remain strictly confidential. Thank you for your interest and cooperation.

Sincerely,

William E. Loadman, Ph.D.
Coordinator, Measurement and
Evaluation Services

Russell J. Spillman, Ph.D.
Acting Dean
College of Education

OSU

The Ohio State University

Office of the Dean
College of Education
1945 North High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43210-1172
Phone 614 422-5790

June 1, 1983

Dear Graduate:

We are still in need of your assistance! As mentioned in our initial correspondence we are attempting to collect information regarding the status of the College of Education's masters and doctoral graduates. Your response to the enclosed questionnaire will enable the college to ascertain how and what its graduates are currently doing. In addition, with this information we will be able to modify our current programs to better prepare our graduates.

We are aware of how busy your schedule is and we would appreciate you taking a few extra moments to complete our questionnaire. A postage paid envelope has been enclosed for your convenience. Please return the questionnaire by June 20, 1983.

Your individual responses will remain strictly confidential. Thank you for your time, interest and cooperation.

Sincerely,

William E. Loadman, Ph.D.
Coordinator, Measurement
and Evaluation Services

Robert A. Burnham
Dean

P.S. If you have already completed a copy of the questionnaire, please disregard this letter.

# APPENDIX C

## Significant ANOVAS for Sample Year Profiles

APPENDIX 1C

SEX BY YEAR

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2 | 2.9225 | 7.480 |
| Within Groups | 856 | 167.2141 | |
| TOTAL | 858 | 170.1366 | |

p = .006

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1978 - 1979 | 135 | 1.39 | .532 |
| 1979 - 1980 | 114 | 1.28 | .451 |
| 1980 - 1981 | 610 | 1.22 | .418 |
| TOTAL | 859 | 1.26 | .445 |

APPENDIX 2C

FULL TIME OR PART TIME EMPLOYMENT BY YEAR

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2 | 5.8707 | 15.702 |
| Within Groups | 781 | 145.9973 | |
| TOTAL | 783 | 151.8680 | |

p = .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1978 - 1979 | 120 | 1.91 | .2898 |
| 1979 - 1980 | 103 | 1.83 | .3816 |
| 1980 - 1981 | 561 | 1.68 | .4651 |
| TOTAL | 784 | 1.74 | .4324 |

APPENDIX 3C

SATISFACTION WITH CURRENT EMPLOYMENT BY YEAR

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2 | 20.1155 | 6.675 |
| Within Groups | 781 | 1176.7530 | |
| TOTAL | 783 | 1196.8685 | |

p = .0013

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1978 - 1979 | 120 | 4.18 | 1.0344 |
| 1980 - 1981 | 102 | 3.88 | 1.1882 |
| 1981 - 1982 | 562 | 3.73 | 1.2714 |
| TOTAL | 784 | 3.82 | 1.2364 |

# APPENDIX D

## Significant ANOVAS For Teaching Subgroup

# APPENDIX 1D

## Teaching Subgroup 1978-1979

APPENDIX 1.1D

TEACHING LEVEL BY PROGRAM AREA

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 13 | 27.5440 | 7.869 |
| Within Groups | 40 | 10.7708 | |
| TOTAL | 53 | 38.3148 | |

p = 0.0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| GRP01 | 1 | 3.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP05 | 3 | 3.00 | .704 |
| GRP10 | 16 | 1.69 | 0.0 |
| GRP11 | 2 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP12 | 3 | 3.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP14 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP17 | 5 | 3.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP18 | 2 | 3.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP21 | 2 | 3.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP23 | 3 | 1.67 | .578 |
| GRP24 | 3 | 1.67 | 1.155 |
| GRP27 | 6 | 3.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP28 | 6 | 3.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP30 | 1 | 3.00 | |
| TOTAL | 54 | 2.35 | .850 |

APPENDIX 1.2D

SUPERVISION OF EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 13 | 5.2996 | 2.063 |
| Within Groups | 40 | 7.9042 | |
| TOTAL | 53 | 13.2037 | |

p = .0399

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| GRP01 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| GRP05 | 3 | 1.33 | .577 |
| GRP10 | 16 | 1.69 | .479 |
| GRP11 | 2 | 1.50 | .707 |
| GRP12 | 3 | 1.66 | .577 |
| GRP14 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP17 | 5 | 1.20 | .447 |
| GRP18 | 2 | 1.50 | .707 |
| GRP21 | 2 | 1.00 | |
| GRP23 | 3 | 1.00 | |
| GRP24 | 3 | 1.00 | |
| GRP27 | 6 | 1.00 | |
| GRP28 | 6 | 1.66 | .516 |
| GRP30 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| TOTAL | 54 | 1.43 | .499 |

APPENDIX 1.30

HELPFUL PERSON IN PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT BY PROGRAM AREA

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 13 | 33.3606 | 2.975 |
| Within Groups | 35 | 30.1905 | |
| TOTAL | 48 | 63.5510 | |

p = .0051

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| GRP01 | 1 | 5.00 | |
| GRP05 | 3 | 1.66 | .577 |
| GRP10 | 14 | 1.71 | .469 |
| GRP11 | 2 | 2.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP12 | 2 | 2.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP14 | 1 | 5.00 | |
| GRP17 | 5 | 3.00 | 1.871 |
| GRP18 | 2 | 2.00 | 1.414 |
| GRP21 | 2 | 2.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP23 | 2 | 1.50 | .707 |
| GRP24 | 2 | 2.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP27 | 6 | 2.66 | 1.211 |
| GRP28 | 6 | 2.16 | .753 |
| GRP30 | 1 | 5.00 | |
| TOTAL | 49 | 2.26 | 1.150 |

APPENDIX 1.4D

CLASSROOM DISCIPLINE BY SEX

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 1.1544 | 5.011 |
| Within Groups | 50 | 11.5187 | |
| TOTAL | 51 | 12.6731 | |

p = .0297

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| FEMALES | 32 | 1.91 | .390 |
| MALES | 20 | 1.60 | .598 |
| TOTAL | 52 | 1.79 | .498 |

APPENDIX 1 SD

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS BY SEX

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 2.0356 | 9.248 |
| Within Groups | 52 | 11.4459 | |
| TOTAL | 53 | 13.4815 | |

p = .0037

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| FEMALES | 33 | 3.64 | .488 |
| MALES | 21 | 3.24 | .436 |
| TOTAL | 54 | 3.48 | .504 |

APPENDIX 1.6D

SIZE OF SCHOOL BY TEACHING LEVEL

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2 | 5.6065 | 5.483 |
| Within Groups | 50 | 25.5632 | |
| TOTAL | 52 | 31.1697 | |

p = .00%

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| ELEMENTARY | 13 | 1.15 | .376 |
| JUNIOR HIGH | 9 | 1.66 | .500 |
| SENIOR HIGH | 31 | 1.94 | .854 |
| TOTAL | 53 | 1.69 | .774 |

# APPENDIX 2D

## Teaching Subgroup 1980-1981

APPENDIX 2.1D

SIZE OF SCHOOL BY PROGRAM AREA

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 16 | 12.5856 | 2.484 |
| Within Groups | 20 | 6.3333 | |
| TOTAL | 36 | 18.9189 | |

p = .0281

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| GRP01 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP03 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| GRP05 | 2 | 3.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP08 | 1 | 3.00 | |
| GRP10 | 12 | 1.33 | .492 |
| GRP11 | 2 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP12 | 2 | 2.00 | 1.414 |
| GRP15 | 2 | 1.50 | .707 |
| GRP16 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| GRP17 | 3 | 1.33 | .577 |
| GRP18 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP21 | 2 | 2.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP23 | 2 | 2.50 | .707 |
| GRP24 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP27 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| GRP28 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP30 | 2 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| TOTAL | 37 | 1.59 | .725 |

APPENDIX 2.2D

TEACHING LEVEL BY PROGRAM AREA

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 16 | 24.0203 | 3.639 |
| Within Groups | 20 | 8.2500 | |
| TOTAL | 36 | 32.2703 | |

p = .0037

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| GRP01 | 1 | 3.00 | |
| GRP03 | 1 | 3.00 | |
| GRP05 | 2 | 3.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP08 | 1 | 3.00 | |
| GRP10 | 12 | 1.75 | .452 |
| GRP11 | 2 | 2.00 | 1.414 |
| GRP12 | 2 | 3.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP15 | 2 | 2.00 | 1.414 |
| GRP16 | 1 | 3.00 | |
| GRP17 | 3 | 3.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP18 | 1 | 3.00 | |
| GRP21 | 2 | 3.00 | |
| GRP23 | 2 | 2.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP24 | 1 | 1.00 | 1.414 |
| GRP27 | 1 | 3.00 | |
| GRP28 | 1 | 3.00 | |
| GRP30 | 2 | 3.00 | |
| TOTAL | 37 | 2.22 | .947 |

APPENDIX 2.3D

EXPECTATIONS FOR SUPERVISING EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES BY PROGRAM AREA

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 16 | 13.9015 | 2.410 |
| Within Groups | 19 | 6.8485 | |
| TOTAL | 35 | 20.7500 | |

p = .0347

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| GRP01 | 1 | 3.00 | |
| GRP03 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| GRP05 | 2 | 1.50 | .707 |
| GRP08 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| GRP10 | 11 | 1.27 | .647 |
| GRP11 | 2 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP12 | 2 | 1.50 | .707 |
| GRP15 | 2 | 1.50 | .707 |
| GRP16 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| GRP17 | 3 | 1.33 | .577 |
| GRP18 | 1 | 4.00 | |
| GRP21 | 2 | 2.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP23 | 2 | 2.50 | .707 |
| GRP24 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP27 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| GRP28 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP30 | 2 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| TOTAL | 36 | 1.58 | .770 |

APPENDIX 2.4D

SIZE OF SCHOOL BY SEX

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 2.1625 | 4.517 |
| Within Groups | 35 | 16.7564 | |
| TOTAL | 36 | 18.9189 | |

p = .0407

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| FEMALE | 24 | 1.42 | .654 |
| MALES | 13 | 1.92 | .759 |
| TOTAL | 37 | 1.59 | .725 |

APPENDIX 2.5D

TEACHING LEVEL BY SEX

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 6.1292 | 8.206 |
| Within Groups | 35 | 26.1410 | |
| TOTAL | 36 | 32.2701 | |

p = .0070

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| FEMALE | 24 | 1.92 | .974 |
| MALE | 13 | 2.77 | .599 |
| TOTAL | 37 | 2.2 | .947 |

APPENDIX 2.6D

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS BY SEX

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 1.8719 | 7.032 |
| Within Groups | 35 | 9.3173 | |
| TOTAL | 36 | 11.1892 | |

p = .0120

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| GRP01 | 24 | 3.63 | .576 |
| GRP02 | 13 | 3.15 | .376 |
| TOTAL | 37 | 3.46 | .558 |

APPENDIX 2 7D

EXPECTATIONS FOR SUPERVISING EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES BY SEX

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 4.9573 | 10.673 |
| Within Groups | 34 | 15.7926 | |
| TOTAL | 35 | 20.7500 | |

p = .0025

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| FEMALES | 23 | 1.30 | .559 |
| MALES | 13 | 2.08 | .862 |
| TOTAL | 36 | 1.58 | .770 |

APPENDIX 2.8D

SUPERVISION OF EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 2.1625 | 11.202 |
| Within Groups | 35 | 6.7564 | |
| TOTAL | 36 | 8.9189 | |

p = .0020

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| FEMALES | 24 | 1.58 | .504 |
| MALES | 13 | 1.08 | .277 |
| TOTAL | 37 | 1.41 | .498 |

APPENDIX 3D

Teaching Subgroup 1980-1981

APPENDIX 3.1D

SIZE OF SCHOOL BY PROGRAM AREA

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 17 | 19.3014 | 2.116 |
| Within Groups | 149 | 79.9319 | |
| TOTAL | 166 | 99.2333 | |

p = .0089

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| GRP01 | 11 | 1.73 | 1.104 |
| GRP02 | 1 | 3.00 | |
| GRP05 | 2 | 1.50 | .707 |
| GRP08 | 2 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP10 | 70 | 1.41 | .625 |
| GRP11 | 4 | 1.75 | .500 |
| GRP12 | 9 | 2.33 | 1.000 |
| GRP13 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| GRP14 | 9 | 1.44 | .727 |
| GRP15 | 5 | 2.00 | .707 |
| GRP16 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP17 | 7 | 2.00 | .817 |
| GRP18 | 7 | 2.00 | 1.000 |
| GRP21 | 3 | 2.67 | .577 |
| GRP23 | 19 | 1.53 | .612 |
| GRP24 | 9 | 1.44 | .727 |
| GRP27 | 3 | 2.33 | .577 |
| GRP28 | 4 | 1.50 | 1.000 |
| TOTAL | 4 | 1.62 | .773 |

APPENDIX 3.2D

TEACHING LEVEL BY PROGRAM AREA

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 17 | 53.3392 | 6.450 |
| Within Groups | 151 | 73.4536 | |
| TOTAL | 168 | 126.7928 | |

p = 0.0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| GRP01 | 11 | 3.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP02 | 1 | 3.00 | |
| GRP05 | 2 | 3.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP08 | 2 | 3.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP10 | 70 | 1.71 | 0.819 |
| GRP11 | 4 | 2.75 | .500 |
| GRP12 | 9 | 3.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP13 | 1 | 3.00 | |
| GRP14 | 9 | 1.89 | 1.054 |
| GRP15 | 6 | 2.83 | .408 |
| GRP16 | 1 | 3.00 | |
| GRP17 | 7 | 2.14 | 1.215 |
| GRP18 | 7 | 3.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP21 | 3 | 3.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP23 | 20 | 2.45 | .605 |
| GRP24 | 9 | 2.80 | .333 |
| GRP27 | 3 | 3.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP28 | 4 | 3.00 | 0.0 |
| TOTAL | 169 | 2.29 | .869 |

APPENDIX 3.3D

SATISFACTION WITH CURRENT EMPLOYMENT BY PROGRAM AREA

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 17 | 34.6243 | 2.219 |
| Within Groups | 150 | 137.6607 | |
| TOTAL | 167 | 172.2851 | |

p = .0057

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| GRP01 | 11 | 3.36 | 1.433 |
| GRP02 | 1 | 5.00 | |
| GRP05 | 2 | 3.50 | 2.121 |
| GRP08 | 2 | 3.00 | 1.414 |
| GRP10 | 69 | 4.52 | .868 |
| GRP11 | 4 | 4.75 | .500 |
| GRP12 | 9 | 4.67 | .500 |
| GRP13 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| GRP14 | 9 | 4.44 | .527 |
| GRP15 | 6 | 4.00 | 1.549 |
| GRP16 | 1 | 5.00 | |
| GRP17 | 7 | 4.29 | .756 |
| GRP18 | 7 | 4.57 | .787 |
| GRP21 | 3 | 4.67 | .577 |
| GRP23 | 20 | 3.80 | 1.152 |
| GRP24 | 9 | 4.33 | .707 |
| GRP27 | 3 | 3.67 | 1.528 |
| GRP28 | 4 | 4.75 | .500 |
| TOTAL | 168 | 4.29 | 1.016 |

APPENDIX 3.4D

PERSPECTIVE ON STUDENTS BY PROGRAM AREA

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 17 | 17.3449 | 2.076 |
| Within Groups | 147 | 72.2303 | |
| TOTAL | 164 | 89.5753 | |

p = .0106

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| GRP01 | 10 | 2.20 | .633 |
| GRP02 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| GRP05 | 2 | 2.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP08 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP10 | 69 | 2.32 | .795 |
| GRP11 | 4 | 2.00 | .817 |
| GRP12 | 9 | 2.33 | .500 |
| GRP13 | 1 | 3.00 | |
| GRP14 | 9 | 2.33 | .500 |
| GRP15 | 6 | 1.67 | .817 |
| GRP16 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| GRP17 | 7 | 2.57 | .787 |
| GRP18 | 7 | 1.57 | .535 |
| GRP21 | 3 | 1.33 | .577 |
| GRP23 | 20 | 1.85 | .671 |
| GRP24 | 8 | 2.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP27 | 3 | 1.33 | .577 |
| GRP28 | 4 | 1.50 | .577 |
| TOTAL | 165 | 2.12 | .739 |

APPENDIX 3.5D

PERSPECTIVE ON INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS BY PROGRAM AREA

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 17 | 25.2819 | 3.009 |
| Within Groups | 148 | 73.1515 | |
| TOTAL | 165 | 98.4333 | |

p = .0002

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| GRP01 | 11 | 2.18 | .405 |
| GRP02 | 1 | 3.00 | |
| GRP05 | 2 | 3.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP08 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP10 | 69 | 2.64 | .747 |
| GRP11 | 4 | 2.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP12 | 9 | 2.22 | .441 |
| GRP13 | 1 | 3.00 | |
| GRP14 | 9 | 2.33 | .866 |
| GRP15 | 6 | 1.83 | .983 |
| GRP16 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| GRP17 | 7 | 2.71 | .756 |
| GRP18 | 7 | 2.43 | .787 |
| GRP21 | 3 | 2.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP23 | 20 | 1.75 | .550 |
| GRP24 | 8 | 2.13 | .991 |
| GRP27 | 3 | 1.33 | .577 |
| GRP28 | 4 | 1.75 | .500 |
| TOTAL | 166 | 2.33 | .772 |

APPENDIX 3.6D

SUPERVISION OF EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES BY PROGRAM AREA

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 17 | 11.9543 | 3.611 |
| Within Groups | 147 | 28.6275 | |
| TOTAL | 164 | 40.5818 | |

p = .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| GRP01 | 11 | 1.18 | .404 |
| GRP02 | 1 | 1.00 | --- |
| GRP05 | 2 | 1.50 | .707 |
| GRP08 | 2 | 1.00 | .000 |
| GRP10 | 68 | 1.72 | .452 |
| GRP11 | 4 | 1.50 | .577 |
| GRP12 | 9 | 1.22 | .441 |
| GRP13 | 1 | 1.00 | --- |
| GRP14 | 9 | 1.56 | .527 |
| GRP15 | 6 | 1.33 | .516 |
| GRP16 | 1 | 1.00 | --- |
| GRP17 | 6 | 1.33 | .516 |
| GRP18 | 7 | 1.00 | .000 |
| GRP21 | 2 | 1.50 | .707 |
| GRP23 | 20 | 1.15 | .366 |
| GRP24 | 9 | 1.22 | .441 |
| GRP27 | 3 | 1.00 | .00 |
| GRP28 | 4 | 1.25 | .500 |

APPENDIX 3.7D

RATING OF EDUCATION PLACEMENT OFFICE BY PROGRAM AREA

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 17 | 94.0243 | 2.878 |
| Within Groups | 150 | 288.2550 | |
| TOTAL | 167 | 382.2793 | |

p = .0003

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| GRP01 | 11 | 1.64 | 1.433 |
| GRP02 | 1 | 5.00 | |
| GRP05 | 2 | 4.50 | .707 |
| GRP08 | 2 | 1.50 | .707 |
| GRP10 | 69 | 2.61 | 1.437 |
| GRP11 | 4 | 2.75 | 1.258 |
| GRP12 | 9 | 3.89 | 1.054 |
| GRP13 | 1 | 3.00 | |
| GRP14 | 9 | 3.11 | 1.764 |
| GRP15 | 6 | 3.50 | 1.378 |
| GRP16 | 1 | 5.00 | |
| GRP17 | 7 | 3.57 | 1.813 |
| GRP18 | 7 | 3.00 | 1.291 |
| GRP21 | 3 | 3.33 | 2.082 |
| GRP23 | 20 | 4.20 | .768 |
| GRP24 | 9 | 3.33 | 1.414 |
| GRP27 | 3 | 3.67 | .577 |
| GRP28 | 4 | 4.00 | 2.00 |
| TOTAL | 168 | 3.065 | 1.513 |

APPENDIX 3.8D

MOTIVATION OF PRESENT STUDENTS BY SEX

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 4.3687 | 9.470 |
| Within Grouns | 166 | 76.5770 | |
| TOTAL | 167 | 80.9456 | |

p = .0024

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| FEMALE | 121 | 2.08 | .726 |
| MALE | 47 | 1.72 | .540 |
| TOTAL | 168 | 1.98 | .697 |

APPENDIX 3.9D

SIZE OF SCHOOL BY SEX

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 13.7460 | 20.276 |
| Within Groups | 166 | 112.5387 | |
| TOTAL | 167 | 126.2847 | |

p = .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| FEMALE | 127 | 2.11 | .920 |
| MALE | 47 | 2.74 | .488 |
| TOTAL | 168 | 2.29 | .870 |

APPENDIX 3.100

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS BY SEX

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 1.2805 | 4.881 |
| Within Groups | 166 | 43.5525 | |
| TOTAL | 167 | 44.8329 | |

p = .0285

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| FEMALE | 118 | 2.75 | 1.480 |
| MALE | 45 | 3.22 | 1.506 |
| TOTAL | 163 | 2.83 | 1.498 |

APPENDIX 3.11D

PERSPECTIVE ON STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS BY SEX

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 7.6291 | 15.318 |
| Within Groups | 162 | 80.6813 | |
| TOTAL | 163 | 88.3104 | |

p = .0001

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| FEMALE | 118 | 2.26 | .733 |
| MALE | 46 | 1.78 | .629 |
| TOTAL | 164 | 2.13 | .736 |

APPENDIX 3.12D

PERSPECTIVE ON INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS BY SEX

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 10.5288 | 20.171 |
| Within Groups | 163 | 85.0826 | |
| TOTAL | 164 | 95.6115 | |

p = .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| FEMALE | 118 | 2.47 | .770 |
| MALE | 47 | 1.91 | .584 |
| TOTAL | 164 | 2.32 | .764 |

APPENDIX 3.13D

SUPERVISION OF EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES BY SEX

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 3.3726 | 14.760 |
| Within Groups | 162 | 37.0172 | |
| TOTAL | 163 | 40.3898 | |

p = .0002

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| FEMALE | 117 | 1.53 | .501 |
| MALE | 47 | 1.21 | .414 |
| TOTAL | 164 | 1.44 | .498 |

APPENDIX 3.1AD

RATING OF EDUCATION PLACEMENT OFFICE BY SEX

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 12.5933 | 5.638 |
| Within Groups | 165 | 368.5424 | |
| TOTAL | 166 | 381.1355 | |

p = .0187

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| FEMALE | 120 | 2.90 | 1.514 |
| MALE | 47 | 3.51 | 1.443 |
| TOTAL | 167 | 3.07 | 1.515 |

APPENDIX 3.1-D

MOTIVATION OF PRESENT STUDENTS BY TEACHING LEVEL

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2 | 5.6992 | 6.292 |
| Within Groups | 134 | 74.2762 | |
| TOTAL | 166 | 79.9754 | |

p = .0023

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| ELEMENTARY | 40 | 2.25 | .630 |
| JUNIOR HIGH | 34 | 2.12 | .591 |
| SENIOR HIGH | 93 | 1.83 | .717 |
| TOTAL | 167 | 1.99 | .694 |

APPENDIX 3.16D

SIZE OF SCHOOL BY TEACHING LEVEL

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2 | 7.0538 | 6.252 |
| Within Groups | 162 | 91.3942 | |
| TOTAL | 164 | 98.4480 | |

p = .0024

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| ELEMENTARY | 40 | 1.35 | .622 |
| JUNIOR HIGH | 34 | 1.47 | .615 |
| SENIOR HIGH | 91 | 1.81 | .842 |
| TOTAL | 165 | 1.63 | .775 |

APPENDIX 3.17D

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS BY TEACHING LEVEL

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2 | 2.9609 | 5.846 |
| Within Groups | 164 | 41.5302 | |
| TOTAL | 166 | 44.4911 | |

p = .0035

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| ELEMENTARY | 40 | 3.65 | .483 |
| JUNIOR HIGH | 34 | 3.32 | .535 |
| SENIOR HIGH | 93 | 3.34 | .499 |
| TOTAL | 167 | 3.41 | .518 |

APPENDIX 3.180

SATISFACTION WITH CURRENT EMPLOYMENT BY TEACHING LEVEL

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2 | 7.0972 | 3.514 |
| Within Groups | 163 | 164.5950 | |
| TOTAL | 165 | 171.6923 | |

p = .0320

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| ELEMENTARY | 39 | 4.59 | .785 |
| JUNIOR HIGH | 34 | 4.41 | .821 |
| SENIOR HIGH | 93 | 4.11 | 1.137 |
| TOTAL | 166 | 4.28 | 1.020 |

APPENDIX 3.19D

PERSPECTIVE ON STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS BY TEACHING LEVEL

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2 | 7.8154 | 8.380 |
| Within Groups | 160 | 74.6136 | |
| TOTAL | 162 | 82.4290 | |

p = .0003

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| ELEMENTARY | 40 | 2.45 | .714 |
| JUNIOR HIGH | 34 | 2.15 | .702 |
| SENIOR HIGH | 89 | 1.92 | .661 |
| TOTAL | 163 | 2.09 | .713 |

APPENDIX 3.20D

PERSPECTIVE ON IMPORTANT LEARNING OUTCOMES BY TEACHING LEVEL

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2 | 6.4771 | 6.567 |
| Within Groups | 160 | 78.9087 | |
| TOTAL | 162 | 85.3858 | |

p = .0018

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| ELEMENTARY | 40 | 3.18 | .781 |
| JUNIOR HIGH | 34 | 2.59 | .701 |
| SENIOR HIGH | 89 | 2.97 | .665 |
| TOTAL | 163 | 2.94 | .726 |

APPENDIX 3.21D

PERSPECTIVE ON INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS BY TEACHING LEVEL

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2 | 4.6386 | 4.238 |
| Within Groups | 161 | 88.1171 | |
| TOTAL | 163 | 92.7557 | |

p = .0161

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| ELEMENTARY | 40 | 2.60 | .810 |
| JUNIOR HIGH | 34 | 2.24 | .699 |
| SENIOR HIGH | 90 | 2.20 | .722 |
| TOTAL | 164 | 2.30 | .754 |

APPENDIX 3.22D

EXPECTATIONS ABOUT EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES BY TEACHING LEVEL

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2 | 5.9052 | 3.404 |
| Within Groups | 152 | 131.8362 | |
| TOTAL | 154 | 137.7414 | |

p = .0358

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| ELEMENTARY | 36 | 1.28 | .513 |
| JUNIOR HIGH | 33 | 1.48 | .972 |
| SENIOR HIGH | 86 | 1.74 | 1.043 |
| TOTAL | 155 | 1.58 | .946 |

APPENDIX 3.230

SUPERVISION OF EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES BY TEACHING LEVEL

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2 | 12.3162 | 35.497 |
| Within Groups | 160 | 27.7574 | |
| TOTAL | 162 | 40.0736 | |

p = .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| ELEMENTARY | 38 | 1.87 | .347 |
| JUNIOR HIGH | 34 | 1.56 | .504 |
| SENIOR HIGH | 91 | 1.21 | .409 |
| TOTAL | 163 | 1.44 | .497 |

APPENDIX 3.24D

RATING OF EDUCATION PLACEMENT OFFICE BY TEACHING LEVEL

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2 | 24.4533 | 5.697 |
| Within Groups | 163 | 349.8169 | |
| TOTAL | 165 | 374.2700 | |

p = .0041

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| ELEMENTARY | 39 | 2.38 | 1.388 |
| JUNIOR HIGH | 34 | 3.15 | 1.617 |
| SENIOR HIGH | 93 | 3.32 | 1.438 |
| TOTAL | 166 | 3.07 | 1.506 |

APPENDIX 4D

Total Teaching Subgroup for All Sample Years

APPENDIX 4.1D

NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS PER YEAR BY YEAR

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2 | 13.6886 | 7.609 |
| Within Groups | 247 | 222.1658 | |
| TOTAL | 249 | 235.8545 | |

p = .0006

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1978 - 1979 | 53 | 2.53 | 1.03 |
| 1980 - 1981 | 36 | 3.03 | 1.00 |
| 1981 - 1982 | 161 | 3.11 | .91 |
| TOTAL | 250 | 2.97 | .95 |

APPENDIX 4.2D

LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE BY YEAR

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2 | 3.0906 | 4.976 |
| Within Groups | 256 | 79.4951 | |
| TOTAL | 258 | 82.5857 | |

p = .0076

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1978 - 1979 | 53 | 3.72 | .495 |
| 1980 - 1981 | 37 | 3.59 | .550 |
| 1981 - 1982 | 169 | 3.45 | .576 |
| TOTAL | 259 | 3.52 | .566 |

# APPENDIX E

## Significant ANOVAS for Education Related Subgroup

APPENDIX 1E

Education Related Subgroup 1978-1979

(No Significant ANOVAS)

# APPENDIX 2E

## Education Related Subgroup 1980-1981

APPENDIX 2.1E

SOUGHT A TEACHING POSITION BY PROGRAM AREA

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 7 | 2.8500 | 3.800 |
| Within Groups | 7 | .7500 | |
| TOTAL | 14 | 3.600 | |

p = .0496

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| GRP02 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP07 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| GRP10 | 5 | 1.00 | |
| GRP13 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP16 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| GRP23 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP24 | 4 | 1.75 | .500 |
| GRP30 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| TOTAL | 15 | 1.40 | .507 |

APPENDIX 2 2E

SOUGHT A TEACHING POSITION BY SEX

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 1.8778 | 14.174 |
| Within Groups | 13 | 1.7222 | |
| TOTAL | 14 | 3.6000 | |

p = .0024

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| FEMALE | 9 | 1.11 | .333 |
| MALE | 6 | 1.83 | .408 |
| TOTAL | 15 | 1.40 | .507 |

APPENDIX 2 3E

REGRET NOT TEACHING BY SEX

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 2.5000 | 39.000 |
| Within Groups | 13 | .8333 | |
| TOTAL | 14 | 3.3333 | |

p = 0.0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| FEMALE | 9 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| MALE | 6 | 1.83 | .408 |
| TOTAL | 15 | 1.33 | .488 |

# APPENDIX 3E

## Education Related Subgroup 1981-1982

APPENDIX 3.1E

FULL TIME/PART TIME EMPLOYMENT BY PROGRAM AREA

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 20 | 7.9827 | 1.955 |
| Within Groups | 165 | 33.6785 | |
| TOTAL | 185 | 41.6612 | |

p = .0118

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| GRP01 | 2 | 2.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP02 | 6 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP03 | 3 | 1.33 | .577 |
| GRP05 | 4 | 1.75 | .500 |
| GRP07 | 2 | 2.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP08 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| GRP10 | 95 | 1.28 | .453 |
| GRP11 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP12 | 12 | 1.33 | .492 |
| GRP14 | 6 | 1.50 | .548 |
| GRP15 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| GRP16 | 3 | 1.67 | .578 |
| GRP17 | 4 | 1.25 | .500 |
| GRP18 | 2 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP21 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP23 | 4 | 1.25 | .500 |
| GRP24 | 21 | 1.38 | .498 |
| GRP25 | 4 | 1.75 | .500 |
| GRP27 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP28 | 10 | 1.10 | .316 |
| GRP30 | 3 | 2.00 | 0.0 |
| TOTAL | 186 | 1.34 | .475 |

APPENDIX 3.2E

SOUGHT A TEACHING POSITION BY PROGRAM AREA

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 17 | 6.2167 | 3.864 |
| Within Groups | 84 | 7.9500 | |
| TOTAL | 101 | 14.1667 | |

p = .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| GRP02 | 4 | 1.25 | .500 |
| GRP03 | 2 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP05 | 2 | 1.50 | .707 |
| GRP07 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| GRP08 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| GRP10 | 45 | 1.07 | .252 |
| GRP11 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP12 | 7 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP14 | 4 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP16 | 3 | 1.67 | .577 |
| GRP17 | 3 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP18 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP23 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP24 | 15 | 1.20 | .414 |
| GRP26 | 4 | 2.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP27 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP28 | 6 | 1.67 | .408 |
| GRP30 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| TOTAL | 102 | 1.17 | .375 |

APPENDIX 3.3E

REGRET NOT TEACHING BY PROGRAM AREA

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 16 | 6.5708 | 2.479 |
| Within Groups | 76 | 12.5905 | |
| TOTAL | 92 | 19.1613 | |

p = .0044

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| GRP02 | 4 | 1.25 | .500 |
| GRP03 | 2 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP05 | 2 | 2.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP07 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| GRP08 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| GRP10 | 41 | 1.09 | .300 |
| GRP11 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP12 | 6 | 1.17 | .408 |
| GRP14 | 4 | 1.75 | .500 |
| GRP16 | 2 | 1.50 | .707 |
| GRP17 | 3 | 1.33 | .577 |
| GRP18 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP23 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP24 | 13 | 1.46 | .519 |
| GRP26 | 4 | 1.75 | .500 |
| GRP27 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP28 | 6 | 1.50 | .548 |
| TOTAL | 93 | 1.29 | .456 |

APPENDIX 3.4E

RATING OF EDUCATION PLACEMENT OFFICE BY PROGRAM AREA

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 20 | 66.0532 | 1.991 |
| Within Groups | 165 | 273.6721 | |
| TOTAL | 185 | 339.7251 | |

p = .0100

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| GRP01 | 2 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP02 | 6 | 2.50 | 1.643 |
| GRP03 | 3 | 1.73 | 1.000 |
| GRP05 | 4 | 2.75 | 1.258 |
| GRP07 | 2 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP08 | 1 | 3.00 | |
| GRP10 | 96 | 2.30 | 1.291 |
| GRP11 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP12 | 12 | 2.83 | 1.642 |
| GRP14 | 6 | 4.33 | .817 |
| GRP15 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP16 | 3 | 1.67 | 1.154 |
| GRP17 | 3 | 2.67 | 1.528 |
| GRP18 | 2 | 2.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP21 | 1 | 4.00 | |
| GRP23 | 4 | 2.75 | 1.709 |
| GRP24 | 21 | 3.00 | 1.265 |
| GRP26 | 4 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP27 | 1 | 3.00 | |
| GRP28 | 10 | 2.30 | 1.059 |
| GRP30 | 3 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| TOTAL | 186 | 2.44 | 1.355 |

APPENDIX 3.5E

FULL TIME/PART TIME EMPLOYMENT BY SEX

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 1.2201 | 5.582 |
| Within Groups | 183 | 40.0010 | |
| TOTAL | 184 | 41.2211 | |

p = .0192

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| FEMALE | 154 | 1.29 | .459 |
| MALE | 31 | 1.51 | .508 |
| TOTAL | 185 | 1.34 | .473 |

APPENDIX 4E

Total Education Related Subgroup for All Sample Years

APPENDIX 4.1E

FULL-TIME/PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT BY YEAR

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2 | 5.5483 | 12.562 |
| Within Groups | 232 | 51.2337 | |
| TOTAL | 234 | 56.7820 | |

p ~ .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1978 - 1979 | 24 | 1.83 | .381 |
| 1980 - 1981 | 25 | 1.52 | .509 |
| 1981 - 1982 | 186 | 1.34 | .475 |
| TOTAL | 235 | 1.41 | .493 |

# APPENDIX F

## Significant ANOVAS for Noneducation-Related Subgroup

# APPENDIX 1F

## Noneducation-Related Subgroup 1978-1979

APPENDIX 1.1F

SOUGHT A TEACHING POSITION BY PROGRAM AREA

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 16 | 6.3056 | 3.744 |
| Within Groups | 19 | 2.0000 | |
| TOTAL | 35 | 8.3056 | |

p = .0036

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| GRP01 | 4 | 1.50 | .577 |
| GRP02 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| GRP03 | 2 | 1.50 | .707 |
| GRP07 | 2 | 2.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP08 | 3 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP10 | 4 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP12 | 2 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP15 | 2 | 2.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP16 | 2 | 1.50 | .707 |
| GRP17 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP18 | 2 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP23 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| GRP24 | 4 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP26 | 2 | 2.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP27 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| GRP28 | 2 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP29 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| TOTAL | 36 | 1.36 | .487 |

APPENDIX 1.2E

RATING OF EDUCATION PLACEMENT OFFICE BY PROGRAM AREA

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 17 | 38.5965 | 2.500 |
| Within Groups | 20 | 18.1667 | |
| TOTAL | 37 | 56.7632 | |

p = .0261

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| GRP01 | 4 | 3.75 | .957 |
| GRP02 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP03 | 2 | 3.00 | 1.414 |
| GRP05 | 1 | 4.00 | |
| GRP07 | 2 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP08 | 3 | 1.66 | 1.154 |
| GRP10 | 4 | 1.50 | 1.000 |
| GRP12 | 2 | 2.50 | 2.121 |
| GRP15 | 2 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP16 | 2 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP17 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP18 | 2 | 3.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP23 | 2 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP24 | 4 | 2.25 | .957 |
| GRP26 | 2 | 2.25 | .707 |
| GRP27 | 1 | 4.00 | |
| GRP28 | 2 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP29 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| TOTAL | 38 | 2.08 | 1.239 |

# APPENDIX 2F

## Noneducation-Related Subgroup 1980-1981

APPENDIX 2.1F

RATING OF EDUCATION PLACEMENT OFFICE BY PROGRAM AREA

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 15 | 31.679 | 2.720 |
| Within Groups | 22 | 17.0833 | |
| TOTAL | 37 | 48.7632 | |

p = .0163

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| GRP01 | 2 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP02 | 2 | 3.00 | 1.414 |
| GRP07 | 5 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP10 | 6 | 3.17 | .408 |
| GRP12 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP13 | 2 | 2.50 | .707 |
| GRP15 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP16 | 3 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP18 | 2 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP21 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP23 | 2 | 2.00 | 1.414 |
| GRP24 | 4 | 2.75 | 1.500 |
| GRP27 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP28 | 4 | 2.50 | 1.291 |
| GRP29 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP30 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| TOTAL | 38 | 1.92 | 1.148 |

APPENDIX 2 2F

USEFULNESS OF EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION BY SEX

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 2.1517 | 5.749 |
| Within Groups | 37 | 13.8483 | |
| TOTAL | 38 | 15.9999 | |

p = .0217

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| FEMALE | 29 | 1.86 | .639 |
| MALE | 10 | 2.40 | .516 |
| TOTAL | 39 | 2.00 | .649 |

APPENDIX 2 3E

SOUGHT A TEACHING POSITION BY SEX

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 1.2051 | 5.283 |
| Within Groups | 35 | 7.9841 | |
| TOTAL | 36 | 9.1892 | |

p = .0276

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| FEMALE | 28 | 1.36 | .488 |
| MALE | 9 | 1.77 | .441 |
| TOTAL | 37 | 1.46 | .505 |

# APPENDIX 3F

## Noneducation-Related Subgroup 1981-1982

APPENDIX 3.1F

SATISFACTION WITH CURRENT EMPLOYMENT BY PROGRAM AREA

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 18 | 55.2477 | 2.027 |
| Within Groups | 159 | 240.7744 | |
| TOTAL | 177 | 296.0220 | |

p = .0111

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| GRP01 | 6 | 3.67 | 1.033 |
| GRP02 | 10 | 3.50 | .972 |
| GRP05 | 8 | 3.75 | 1.488 |
| GRP07 | 25 | 4.36 | .757 |
| GRP10 | 40 | 3.03 | 1.441 |
| GRP11 | 1 | 5.00 | |
| GRP12 | 11 | 3.45 | 1.128 |
| GRP13 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| GRP14 | 3 | 3.67 | .577 |
| GRP15 | 2 | 3.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP16 | 8 | 4.13 | 1.356 |
| GRP17 | 11 | 3.45 | 1.293 |
| GRP18 | 2 | 5.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP23 | 10 | 3.40 | 1.578 |
| GRP24 | 13 | 3.62 | 1.193 |
| GRP26 | 15 | 4.33 | .976 |
| GRP27 | 1 | 5.00 | |
| GRP28 | 10 | 3.10 | 1.524 |
| GRP30 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| TOTAL | 178 | 3.62 | 1.293 |

APPENDIX 3.2F

USEFULNESS OF EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION BY PROGRAM AREA

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 18 | 20.2046 | 2.213 |
| Within Groups | 159 | 80.6549 | |
| TOTAL | 177 | 100.8595 | |

p = .0048

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| GRP01 | 7 | 2.00 | .817 |
| GRP02 | 10 | 2.00 | .667 |
| GRP05 | 8 | 2.13 | .641 |
| GRP07 | 25 | 2.56 | .507 |
| GRP10 | 39 | 1.62 | .748 |
| GRP11 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| GRP12 | 11 | 1.73 | .647 |
| GRP13 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP14 | 3 | 2.00 | 1.000 |
| GRP15 | 2 | 2.00 | 1.414 |
| GRP16 | 8 | 1.75 | .707 |
| GRP17 | 11 | 2.27 | .647 |
| GRP18 | 2 | 1.50 | .707 |
| GRP23 | 10 | 1.70 | .675 |
| GRP24 | 13 | 1.85 | .689 |
| GRP26 | 15 | 2.33 | .817 |
| GRP27 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| GRP28 | 10 | 1.90 | .876 |
| GRP30 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| TOTAL | 178 | 1.97 | .755 |

APPENDIX 3.3F

SOUGHT A TEACHING POSITION BY PROGRAM AREA

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 18 | 13.2020 | 3.788 |
| Within Groups | 152 | 29.4297 | |
| TOTAL | 170 | 42.6316 | |

p = .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| GRP01 | 7 | 1.57 | .535 |
| GRP02 | 9 | 1.57 | .500 |
| GRP05 | 8 | 1.63 | .518 |
| GRP07 | 25 | 1.92 | .277 |
| GRP10 | 39 | 1.26 | .442 |
| GRP11 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| GRP12 | 11 | 1.36 | .505 |
| GRP13 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP14 | 3 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP15 | 2 | 1.50 | .707 |
| GRP16 | 8 | 1.38 | .518 |
| GRP17 | 9 | 1.33 | .500 |
| GRP18 | 2 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP23 | 10 | 1.70 | .483 |
| GRP24 | 13 | 1.23 | .439 |
| GRP26 | 11 | 1.82 | .405 |
| GRP27 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP28 | 10 | 1.20 | .422 |
| GRP30 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| TOTAL | 171 | 1.47 | .501 |

APPENDIX 3.4F

REGRET NOT TEACHING BY PROGRAM AREA

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 18 | 16.0439 | 5.221 |
| Within Groups | 144 | 24.5818 | |
| TOTAL | 162 | 40.6257 | |

p = .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| GRP01 | 7 | 1.86 | .378 |
| GRP02 | 8 | 1.25 | .463 |
| GRP05 | 8 | 1.88 | .354 |
| GRP07 | 24 | 1.92 | .282 |
| GRP10 | 39 | 1.36 | .486 |
| GRP11 | 1 | 2.00 | |
| GRP12 | 11 | 1.36 | .505 |
| GRP13 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP14 | 3 | 1.33 | .577 |
| GRP15 | 2 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP16 | 5 | 1.60 | .548 |
| GRP17 | 9 | 1.44 | .527 |
| GRP18 | 2 | 2.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP23 | 10 | 1.80 | .422 |
| GRP24 | 13 | 1.23 | .489 |
| GRP26 | 9 | 2.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP27 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP28 | 9 | 1.00 | 0.0 |
| GRP30 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| TOTAL | 163 | 1.53 | .501 |

APPENDIX 3.5F

RATING OF EDUCATION PLACEMENT OFFICE BY PROGRAM AREA

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 18 | 82.2009 | 2.905 |
| Within Groups | 160 | 251.5081 | |
| TOTAL | 178 | 333.7090 | |

p = .0002

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| GRP01 | 7 | 1.71 | 1.254 |
| GRP02 | 10 | 2.10 | 1.663 |
| GRP05 | 8 | 2.63 | 1.768 |
| GRP07 | 25 | 1.20 | .707 |
| GRP10 | 40 | 2.80 | 1.181 |
| GRP11 | 1 | 3.00 | |
| GRP12 | 11 | 2.64 | 1.433 |
| GRP13 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| GRP14 | 4 | 4.33 | .577 |
| GRP15 | 2 | 2.50 | 2.121 |
| GRP16 | 8 | 1.25 | 1.500 |
| GRP17 | 11 | 2.18 | .982 |
| GRP18 | 2 | 2.50 | .707 |
| GRP23 | 10 | 2.50 | 1.650 |
| GRP24 | 13 | 3.08 | 1.553 |
| GRP26 | 15 | 2.13 | 1.356 |
| GRP27 | 1 | 4.00 | |
| GRP28 | 10 | 2.40 | 1.174 |
| GRP30 | 1 | 1.00 | |
| TOTAL | 179 | 2.30 | 1.370 |

# APPENDIX 4F

## Total Noneducation-related Subgroup for All Sample Years

APPENDIX A 1F

REGRET NOT TEACHING BY YEAR

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2 | 1.9323 | 3.854 |
| Within Groups | 232 | 58.1519 | |
| TOTAL | 234 | 60.0842 | |

p = .0226

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1978 - 1979 | 34 | 1.76 | .496 |
| 1980 - 1981 | 35 | 1.45 | .505 |
| 1981 - 1982 | 166 | 1.53 | .506 |

APPENDIX 4.2F

SATISFACTION WITH CURRENT EMPLOYMENT BY YEAR

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2 | 20.4539 | 6.32 |
| Within Groups | 234 | 378.4102 | |
| TOTAL | 236 | 398.8641 | |

p = .0021

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1978 - 1979 | 24 | 4.33 | 1.05 |
| 1980 - 1981 | 24 | 3.41 | 1.21 |
| 1981 - 1982 | 189 | 3.35 | 1.30 |
| TOTAL | 237 | 3.46 | 1.27 |

# APPENDIX G

## Significant ANOVAS by Employment Subgroup (All Sample Years)

## APPENDIX 1G

Significant ANOVAS by Employment Subgroup Total Sample

APPENDIX 1.1G

FULL-TIME OR PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUP

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2 | 38.0024 | 132.220 |
| Within Groups | 752 | 108.0689 | |
| TOTAL | 754 | 146.0713 | |

p = .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| Teaching | 260 | 1.93 | .254 |
| Education Related | 235 | 1.41 | .493 |
| Noneducation-related | 260 | 1.84 | .365 |
| TOTAL | 755 | 1.74 | .440 |

APPENDIX 1.26

SATISFACTION WITH CURRENT EMPLOYMENT BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUP

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2 | 92.1313 | 32.514 |
| Within Groups | 752 | 1065.4167 | |
| TOTAL | 754 | 1157.5479 | |

p = .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| Teaching | 259 | 4.29 | .975 |
| Education Related | 237 | 3.46 | 1.300 |
| Noneducation-related | 259 | 3.69 | 1.278 |
| TOTAL | 755 | 3.82 | 1.239 |

APPENDIX 1.36

USEFULNESS OF EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUP

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2 | 45.7842 | 60.327 |
| Within Groups | 751 | 284.9814 | |
| TOTAL | 753 | 330.7654 | |

p = .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| Teaching | 260 | 2.56 | .519 |
| Education Related | 235 | 2.44 | .585 |
| Noneducation-related | 259 | 1.99 | .723 |
| TOTAL | 754 | 2.33 | .663 |

APPENDIX 1.4G

SOUGHT A TEACHING POSITION BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUP

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 5.0555 | 22.831 |
| Within Groups | 374 | 82.8150 | |
| TOTAL | 375 | 87.8705 | |

p = .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| Education Related | 128 | 1.21 | .409 |
| Noneducation-related | 248 | 1.46 | .499 |
| TOTAL | 376 | 1.37 | .484 |

APPENDIX 1.5G

REGRET THEY ARE NOT TEACHING BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUPS

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 4.0752 | 16.635 |
| Within Groups | 350 | 85.7415 | |
| TOTAL | 351 | 89.8167 | |

p = .0001

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| Education Related | 117 | 1.33 | .470 |
| Noneducation-related | 235 | 1.55 | .507 |
| TOTAL | 352 | 1.48 | .495 |

APPENDIX 1.66

RATING OF THE EDUCATION PLACEMENT OFFICE BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUPS

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2 | 97.4512 | 25.289 |
| Within Groups | 751 | 1446.9919 | |
| TOTAL | 753 | 1544.4431 | |

p = .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| Teaching | 259 | 3.05 | 1.462 |
| Education Related | 235 | 2.44 | 1.365 |
| Noneducation-related | 260 | 2.22 | 1.333 |
| TOTAL | 754 | 2.57 | 1.432 |

APPENDIX 2G

Significant ANOVAS by Employment Subgroup 1978 - 1979

APPENDIX 2.16

RATING OF THE EDUCATION PLACEMENT OFFICE BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUP

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2 | 16.6156 | 4.525 |
| Within Groups | 114 | 209.2981 | |
| TOTAL | 116 | 225.9137 | |

p = .0128

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| Teaching | 54 | 2.98 | 1.339 |
| Education Related | 24 | 2.54 | 1.532 |
| Noneducation-related | 39 | 2.13 | 1.260 |
| TOTAL | 117 | 2.61 | 1.396 |

APPENDIX 2.26

USEFULNESS OF EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUP

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2 | 5.8634 | 8.302 |
| Within Groups | 114 | 40.2564 | |
| TOTAL | 116 | 46.1197 | |

p = .0004

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| Teaching | 54 | 2.61 | .529 |
| Education Related | 24 | 2.42 | .654 |
| Noneducation-related | 39 | 2.10 | .641 |
| TOTAL | 117 | 2.40 | .631 |

APPENDIX 3G

Significant ANOVAS by Employment Subgroup 1980 - 1981

APPENDIX 3.16

FULL-TIME/PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUP

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2 | 3.0704 | 12.835 |
| Within Groups | 98 | 11.7216 | |
| TOTAL | 100 | 14.7920 | |

p = .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| Teaching | 37 | 1.95 | .229 |
| Education Related | 25 | 1.52 | .509 |
| Noneducation-related | 39 | 1.89 | .307 |
| TOTAL | 101 | 1.82 | .385 |

APPENDIX 3.26

SATISFACTION WITH CURREN EMPLOYMENT BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUP

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2 | 13.8110 | 5.371 |
| Within Groups | 97 | 125.1884 | |
| TOTAL | 99 | 138.9995 | |

p = .0062

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| Teaching | 37 | 4.35 | .888 |
| Education Related | 24 | 3.42 | 1.213 |
| Noneducation-related | 39 | 3.77 | 1.287 |
| TOTAL | 100 | 3.90 | 1.186 |

APPENDIX 3.36

USEFULNESS OF EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUP

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2 | 8.9736 | 14.475 |
| Within Groups | 97 | 30.0664 | |
| TOTAL | 99 | 39.0400 | |

p = .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| Teaching | 37 | 2.68 | .475 |
| Education Related | 24 | 2.46 | .509 |
| Noneducation-related | 39 | 2.00 | .649 |
| TOTAL | 100 | 2.36 | .628 |

APPENDIX 3.46

RATING OF THE EDUCATION PLACEMENT OFFICE BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUP

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2 | 28.1321 | 8.359 |
| Within Groups | 98 | 164.9169 | |
| TOTAL | 100 | 193.0490 | |

p = .0004

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| Teaching | 37 | 1.43 | .235 |
| Education Related | 25 | 1.32 | .264 |
| Noneducation-related | 39 | 1.?4 | .183 |
| TOTAL | 101 | 1.39 | .138 |

APPENDIX 4G

Significant ANOVAS by Employment Subgroup 1981 - 1982

APPENDIX 4.1G

FULL-TIME/PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUPS

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2 | 34.9381 | 115.346 |
| Within Groups | 534 | 80.8736 | |
| TOTAL | 536 | 115.8116 | |

p = .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| Teaching | 169 | 1.92 | .277 |
| Education Related | 186 | 1.34 | .475 |
| Noneducation-related | 182 | 1.82 | .382 |
| TOTAL | 537 | 1.69 | .465 |

APPENDIX 4.2G

SATISFACTION WITH CURRENT EMPLOYMENT BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUPS

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2 | 80.9946 | 27.341 |
| Within Groups | 535 | 792.4513 | |
| TOTAL | 537 | 873.4458 | |

p = .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| Teaching | 168 | 4.29 | 1.016 |
| Education Related | 189 | 3.35 | 1.303 |
| Noneducation-related | 181 | 3.61 | 1.293 |
| TOTAL | 538 | 3.73 | 1.275 |

APPENDIX A 36

SOUGHT A TEACHING POSITION BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUPS

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 6.1934 | 29.475 |
| Within Groups | 274 | 57.5738 | |
| TOTAL | 275 | 63.7672 | |

p = .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| Education Related | 102 | 1.17 | .375 |
| Noneducation-related | 174 | 1.48 | .501 |
| TOTAL | 276 | 1.36 | .482 |

APPENDIX 4.46

REGRET THEY ARE NOT TEACHING BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUPS

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 3.4277 | 14.558 |
| Within Groups | 257 | 60.5098 | |
| TOTAL | 258 | 63.9375 | |

p = .0002

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| Education Related | 93 | 1.29 | .456 |
| Noneducation-related | 166 | 1.53 | .501 |
| TOTAL | 259 | 1.44 | .498 |

APPENDIX A.56

RATING OF THE EDUCATION PLACEMENT OFFICE BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUP

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2 | 57.4932 | 14.368 |
| Within Groups | 533 | 1066.3643 | |
| TOTAL | 535 | 1123.8572 | |

p = .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| Teaching | 168 | 3.07 | 1.513 |
| Education Related | 186 | 2.44 | 1.355 |
| Noneducation-related | 182 | 2.30 | 1.379 |
| TOTAL | 536 | 2.59 | 1.449 |

# APPENDIX H

## Significant ANOVAS on Student Teaching Items

APPENDIX 1.1H

ABILITY LEVEL OF STUDENTS DURING STUDENT TEACHING BY YEAR

| SOURCE | D.F. | S.S. | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2 | 3.2505 | 3.870 |
| Within Groups | 809 | 339.7420 | |
| TOTAL | 811 | 342.9924 | |

p = .0212

SUMMARY STATISTICS

| GROUP | N | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1978 - 1979 | 126 | 1.90 | .599 |
| 1980 - 1981 | 107 | 2.14 | .621 |
| 1981 - 1982 | 579 | 1.99 | .663 |
| TOTAL | 812 | 2.00 | .650 |

# APPENDIX I

## Population and Sample Sizes by Program Area

APPENDIX II

1978 - 1979

POPULATION AND SAMPLE SIZES

| PROGRAM AREA | POPULATION | TARGET SAMPLE | ACTUAL SAMPLE |
|---|---|---|---|
| AGRICULTURE EDUCATION | 37 | 8 | 5 |
| ART EDUCATION | 32 | 6 | 2 |
| BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE EDUCATION | 8 | 5 | 2 |
| BUSINESS EDUCATION | 8 | 5 | 4 |
| DANCE EDUCATION | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DENTAL HYGIENE EDUCATION | 36 | 7 | 3 |
| DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION(VOC-TECH) | 11 | 5 | 4 |
| ELEMENTARY EDUCATION | 267 | 53 | 34 |
| ENGLISH EDUCATION | 34 | 7 | 7 |
| ENGLISH COMMUNICATION | 9 | 5 | 0 |
| EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN | 22 | 0 | 2 |
| FOREIGN LANGUAGE | 16 | 5 | 3 |
| HEALTH EDUCATION | 10 | 5 | 4 |
| HOME ECONOMICS | 40 | 8 | 7 |
| INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY | 33 | 7 | 7 |
| MATHEMATICS | 16 | 5 | 2 |
| MUSIC EDUCATION | 59 | 12 | 7 |
| PHYSICAL EDUCATION | 72 | 14 | 13 |
| RECREATION EDUCATION | 40 | 8 | 4 |
| SCIENCE EDUCATION | 13 | 8 | 8 |
| SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION | 78 | 16 | 8 |
| SPEECH-THEATRE EDUCATION | 6 | 5 | 2 |
| TRADE AND INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION | 6 | 3 | 2 |

APPENDIX 2I

1980 - 1981

POPULATION AND SAMPLE SIZES

| PROGRAM AREA | POPULATION | TARGET SAMPLE | ACTUAL SAMPLE |
|---|---|---|---|
| AGRICULTURE EDUCATION | 37 | 7 | 3 |
| ART EDUCATION | 38 | 8 | 4 |
| BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE EDUCATION | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| BUSINESS EDUCATION | 13 | 3 | 2 |
| DANCE EDUCATION | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| DENTAL HYGIENE EDUCATION | 38 | 8 | 6 |
| DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION(VOC-TECH) | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| ELEMENTARY EDUCATION | 315 | 60 | 37 |
| ENGLISH EDUCATION | 40 | 8 | 4 |
| ENGLISH COMMUNICATION | 5 | 5 | 3 |
| EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN | 35 | 7 | 3 |
| FOREIGN LANGUAGE | 10 | 2 | 4 |
| HEALTH EDUCATION | 7 | 1 | 5 |
| HOME ECONOMICS | 30 | 6 | 3 |
| INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY | 22 | 4 | 4 |
| MATHEMATICS | 17 | 3 | 3 |
| MUSIC EDUCATION | 50 | 10 | 7 |
| PHYSICAL EDUCATION | 71 | 14 | 9 |
| RECREATION EDUCATION | 56 | 11 | 0 |
| SCIENCE EDUCATION | 10 | 2 | 2 |
| SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION | 51 | 10 | 6 |
| SPEECH-THEATRE EDUCATION | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| TRADE AND INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION | 8 | 2 | 4 |

APPENDIX 3I

1981 - 1982

POPULATION AND SAMPLE SIZES

| PROGRAM AREA | POPULATION | TARGET SAMPLE | ACTUAL SAMPLE |
|---|---|---|---|
| AGRICULTURE EDUCATION | 35 | | 23 |
| ART EDUCATION | 34 | | 19 |
| BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE EDUCATION | 6 | | 3 |
| BROADCAST COMMUNICATIONS EDUCATION | 1 | | 0 |
| BUSINESS EDUCATION | 18 | | 16 |
| DANCE EDUCATION | 1 | | 0 |
| DENTAL HYGIENE EDUCATION | 35 | | 28 |
| DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION(VOC-TECH) | 6 | | 3 |
| ELEMENTARY EDUCATION | 403 | | 246 |
| ENGLISH EDUCATION | 52 | | 38 |
| ENGLISH COMMUNICATION | 3 | | 2 |
| EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN | 18 | | 24 |
| FOREIGN LANGUAGE | 11 | | 10 |
| HEALTH EDUCATION | 11 | | 12 |
| HOME ECONOMICS | 31 | | 22 |
| INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY | 22 | | 14 |
| MATHEMATICS | 8 | | 4 |
| MUSIC EDUCATION | 55 | | 35 |
| PHYSICAL EDUCATION | 75 | | 45 |
| RECREATION EDUCATION | 46 | | 22 |
| SCIENCE EDUCATION | 4 | | 6 |
| SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION | 63 | | 30 |
| SPEECH-THEATRE EDUCATION | 3 | | 0 |
| TRADE AND INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION | 6 | | 4 |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

FOLLOW-UP SURVEY OF TEACHER EDUCATION

GRADUATES 1978-1979, 1980-1981, and 1981-1982

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

## OVERVIEW

The following is an executive summary of Technical Report #8 of the Follow-Up Study of The Ohio State University's Teacher Education Programs. The present study is on graduates of the College of Education for the academic years 1978-1979, 1980-1981, and 1981-1982. This study is one in a series of studies on the College of Education's graduates conducted since 1977. These studies are conducted in part to meet the standards of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Ohio State Department of Education's standards for evaluating teacher education students.

In the past years only a sample of first year teachers were surveyed for the follow-up study; this year in addition to all 1982 graduates, a 20 percent random sample, stratified by program area, of 1978-79 graduates and 1980-1981 were surveyed. This method allows for more accurate comparisons between sample years and allows for assessment, over time, of such factors as satisfaction with employment, usefulness of educational preparation and feelings about the teaching profession. The sample sizes were as follows:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1981-1982 | Graduates | 961 (entire population) |
| 1980-1981 | Graduates | 193 |
| 1978-1979 | Graduates | 213 |

The response rate for each year is:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1981-1982 | 597 | 62% |
| 1980-1981 | 113 | 59% |
| 1978-1979 | 138 | 65% |

In addition to the changes in the sampling procedure, changes were made in the data collection techniques. The questionnaire was studied and changes in the wording of certain items were made, other items were eliminated and new items included. The questionnaire was structured to obtain information regarding: present job status; satisfaction with job; student teaching experience; attitudes toward preservice academic training; educational background and aspirations; and demographics.

Statistical Analysis and Reporting

In previous years the data collected from the follow-up questionnaire were analyzed primarily by computing frequencies and percentages for each item. From that analysis a profile was developed of the sample and some comparisons made with the previous year. The analysis for this year was more extensive.

First a chi-square to determine the representativeness of the respondents by program area and sex for each sample year was performed. In addition, descriptive statistics including means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages were produced for each item.

From these results a description or profile of the students was developed for each sample year. Comparisons between sample years were made and differences examined using analysis of variance techniques. Comparisons were also made between the following groups within each year:

(1) Program Areas

(2) Teaching Level (elementary, middle, secondary)

(3) Sex

(4) Current Employment Subgroups

Results

The follow-up questionnaire yielded a large amount of information about the graduates surveyed from the three sample years. The 1980-1981 sample and the 1981-1982 samples both proved to be representative of their populations on both program area and sex. The 1978-1979 sample was representative of its population on the sex variable but not on the program area variable. The nonrepresentativeness on the program area variable was due to the over sampling of small program areas in order to include enough subjects to produce stable statistical results for these program areas. The impact on this situation on the outcome of the study was found to be neglible and therefore the results present a valid profile of graduate of the college. Analyses indicated that there was very little difference among the sample years. In addition, the comparisons made between sex, among program areas (academic majors), employment subgroups and teaching produced some interesting and important findings. Briefly, some of those findings are:

1. The majority of the graduates (75%) are female; yet there has been a progressive increase in the number of males graduates from sample year to sample year.

2. Over 90 percent of the graduates are employed but approximately 1/3 are in noneducation related positions.
3. Although the graduates are generally satisfied with their current positions, those teaching are significantly more satisfied than those in education related or noneducation related employment.
4. The majority of the students (73%) felt that personal initiative was the most important strategy for securing employment.
5. Within the teaching employment subgroup, those individuals teaching the longest were more satisfied with their jobs than the more recent teachers.
6. The location of the graduates' current teaching positions can be grouped into the following community types:

| | |
|---|---|
| Urban | 25% |
| Suburban | 35% |
| Rural | 41% |

7. Fifty-five percent of the teachers are teaching at the senior high level; 27 percent are teaching at the elementary level and 18 percent at the junior high level.
8. Sixty-six percent of the teachers feel that supervision of extracurricular activities is voluntary and 55 percent of the teachers actually supervisor extracurricular activities.
9. Generally, the graduates reported their student teaching experience to be quite successful. For example, 98% of the graduates rated their experience as somewhat successful or successful; 88 percent reported having a good or very good relationship with their cooperating teacher.

10. Seventy-five percent of the students completed all four years at The Ohio State University.
11. Approximately 50 percent expressed a desire to obtain an advanced degree in education; another 25 percent plan to obtain one in a noneducation field.

Because the samples, primarily, were representative of their populations, these findings can be generalized with confidence to the target populations of College of Education graduates or specific program areas. The complete Technical Report of the follow-up process and findings can be obtained from William Loadman at (614) 422-1257. In addition, individual program area results can also be requested.

1/19/84